This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at http://books.google.com/

881
E37
A 470561
UNIV. OF MICH.
JUL 25 1907
E37

Aspects of the Speech in the Later Greek Epic

BY

GEORGE WICKER ELDERKIN

A Dissertation

SUBMITTED TO THE BOARD OF UNIVERSITY STUDIES OF THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY
IN CONFORMITY WITH THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BALTIMORE
J. H. FURST COMPANY
1906

1837
ARTES VERITAS SCIENTIA
LIBRARY OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
TUEBOR
SI QUÆRIS PENINSULAM AMŒNAM
CIRCUMSPICE

881
E37

Aspects of the Speech in the Later Greek Epic

BY

GEORGE WICKER ELDERKIN

A Dissertation

SUBMITTED TO THE BOARD OF UNIVERSITY STUDIES OF THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY
IN CONFORMITY WITH THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BALTIMORE
J. H. FURST COMPANY
1906

CONTENTS.

164157

ASPECTS OF THE SPEECH IN THE LATER GREEK EPIC.

The life and vigor of the poems of Homer has among its constituents the important element of speech.[1] The extent of its employment has been measured and the statistics show that just one-half of Homer is composed of the directly recorded utterances of his characters. The speech, therefore, with its varied aspects, promises to be of significance as a chapter of comparative study in Greek epic poetry. Its subsequent fate may fairly be expected to throw no little light upon the relations of the later epic poets to the source of their inspiration, upon the extent of their adherence to and departure from Homeric standards. Particularly is this so in the case of Quintus of Smyrna, for the reader readily recognizes that the immediate purpose of the Posthomerica is to fill in the gap between the poems of Homer, although the poem of Quintus looks backward to the Iliad rather than forward to the Odyssey. The feeling that Quintus regarded himself as more than a mere imitator of Homer and aspired to some independence as an epic poet is perfectly compatible in view of his obvious purpose, with an exacting comparison of the Iliad and the Posthomerica. We shall find departures more serious than the un-Homeric designation of the dog of Hades as Κέρβερος (VI, 254) and the absence of the favorite Homeric epithet of Nestor Γερήνιος ἱππότα. We shall find coincidences as interesting as the hostility of the poets to the word λόγος.[2]

[1] v. Plato, *Rep.*, 393 B.

[2] A. Nauck, *Mélanges Gréco-Romains*, II (1863), 378, note, finds that λόγος occurs but once in Quintus, III, 499 :

> *Ζεῦ πάτερ, ἦ ῥά τι καὶ σὺ βροτοὺς ψευδέσσι λόγοισι*
> *θέλγεις,*

The practical non-occurrence of the word in Homer is well known. Of the two examples, that in α 56 :

Between Homer and the epic poets Apollonius and Nonnus such intimacy of theme does not exist, but a departmental interest attaches to their speeches. The two Argonauticas are naturally compared. The epic bits of Tryphiodorus and Colluthus, and Tzetzes are not worthy of much attention. So large a field of investigation as the comparative study of the epic speech, involving as it does a multitude of matters, is not immediately to be exhausted. In the following pages Apollonius and Quintus have received the more immediate consideration, but even in these, little other than externals has been treated.

Amount of Speech and Kindred Topics.

Later Greek epic poetry never returns to the amount of speech that is found in Homer. M. Schneidewin[1] records the fact that 50 per cent. of Homer is speech—44 per cent. of the Iliad and 56 per cent. of the Odyssey. In the 27713 verses of the Homeric poems, 13869 are speech. Of the Argonautica of Apollonius 29 per cent. is speech or 1699 verses out of a total 5832. Quintus in the Posthomerica has 24 per cent. speech or 2073½

αἰεὶ δὲ μαλακοῖσι καὶ αἱμυλίοισι λόγοισι
θέλγει,

so closely resembles the single case in Quintus as to be regarded the source of it. The use of the phrase *αἱμυλίοισι λόγοισι* in Hesiod (Th. 890), Homeric Hymn to Hermes (317), Theognis (704) and Apollonius (III, 1141) leads one to believe that it is a bit of Homeric phraseology which became the occasional property of epic poets. Wellauer (1828) on Apollonius, III, 1141, has the following note: "Hoc uno loco Apollonius vocabulo *λόγος* usus est, raro omnino apud epicos poetas et ita ut Homeri et Hesiodi auctoritatem sequeretur qui *αἱμυλίοισι λόγοισι* dixerunt Od., I, 56, Theog. 889." *λόγος* is absent from the Orphic Argonautica and is not to be found in Nonnus who collects a few of his terms for "word" in XIII, 480–4. For *αἱμυλίοισι λόγοισι θέλγει* an equivalent is found in *κλεψινόοις δ' ὀάροισι παρήπαφεν*, XL, 7. Weinberger's index verborum for Colluthus and Tryphiodorus shows the absence of *λόγος* from their epic pieces. The repugnance of epic to the word is doubtless an expression of the mutually repellent character of Logos and Mythos. "When Logos comes in Mythos retreats. There is no *λόγος* in Homer, and the first prose writers were the first critics." (B. L. Gildersleeve in preface (x) to Cary's translation, *The Histories of Herodotus*, New York, 1901).

[1] "Statistisches zu Homeros und Vergilius," *N. J. f. Ph.*, 1884, 2, 130.

verses in a total of 8786. The Orphic Argonautica which is believed to have been written after the time of Quintus and before Nonnus is 12 per cent. speech. Of its 1384 verses, 170 are occupied with speeches. A reaction shows itself in Nonnus whose poem is 36 per cent. speech. Of 21279 verses comprising the Dionysiaca 7611 are given to speech. Tryphiodorus sinks to 20 per cent., while Colluthus is capable of 37 per cent. Tzetzes in his wretched performances has but 84 verses of speech in 1675 or 5 per cent.

From Homer to Tzetzes, Greek epic poetry shows a steady decline in the number of speeches if we leave out of the account the Orphic Argonautica in which speeches are rarer than in Nonnus, and Colluthus who returns almost to the frequency of the Iliad. The decline may be indicated in the following way: Homer employs 1311 speeches,[1] or one for every 21 verses of his poems. Apollonius has 143 speeches, or one speech for every 41 verses. The number of speeches in Quintus is 176—one for every 50 verses. Homeric frequency would demand of Quintus about 418 speeches. Had Quintus observed the frequency in the Iliad we should have had 382 speeches. The Orphic Argonautica has 14 speeches, or one for every 96 verses. The Dionysiaca contains 305 speeches, or one for every 70 verses.[2] Tryphiodorus has 8 speeches, or one for every 86 verses. The nearest approach to Homer is found in the little episode of Colluthus where 16 speeches occur, one for every 25 verses. Tzetzes has 14, or one for every 105 verses.

Schneidewin has pointed out that 33 of the speeches of Homer consist of 40 or more verses. But the limit is purely arbitrary and leads to wrong conclusions. The average length of the epic speech increases in Apollonius (11.88 vv.), Quintus (11.78 vv.) and Nonnus (24.95 vv.) as compared with Homer (10.57 vv.), and this would indicate that the later epic poets preferred slightly longer speeches than Homer. Yet as far as speeches of more than

[1] Schneidewin, *l. c.*

[2] There are a few passages in Nonnus that have been reckoned as speech, though their character as such may be questioned. They are XIII, 221; XV, 398–418; XX, 137–41.

40 verses are concerned, Apollonius shows no real departure from Homeric demands. Allowance must be made for the difference in the length of the poems and for the relative frequency of speeches in the two poets.[1]

The shortest speech in Homer consists of a single verse unless it is possible to construe as such O 82: *ἔνθ' εἴην ἢ ἔνθα.* Of speeches limited to a single verse there are nine in the Iliad,[2] eleven in the Odyssey.[3] There are no cases of such speeches in Apollonius. Only two or three would be expected. There is one instance in Quintus, XII, 153. It is in Nonnus that the shortest speech in Greek epic is found, XIII, 485 *στῆθι, τάλαν.*

The range of the percentages of speech for the books of the different epic poems is a matter of some significance. Schneidewin's tables show that the books of Homer range in percentage of speech from 19 (ι) to 82 (I). The books of Apollonius range from 20 (I) to 39 (III); those of Quintus from 3 (XI) to 45 (V). The books of Nonnus range from 3 (XIII) to 83 (XXXVIII). The following tables do for the later epic poets what Schneidewin has done for Homer. They give the books of the later epic poems arranged according to their percentages of speech.

[1] Homer has 33 speeches of more than 40 vv. The bulk of Apollonius is less than ¼ and more than $^1/_5$ of that of Homer. Hence one would expect less than 8 and more than 6 such speeches, *i. e.*, about 7 for Apollonius. But Apollonius contains only $^3/_5$ as much speech as Homer (Homer 50 per cent.; Apollonius 29 per cent.), and therefore only $^3/_5$ of 7 or 4 such speeches fall to the lot of Apollonius. By considering the relative frequency of speech as given in lines (1 for every 41 vv. in Apollonius; one for every 21 vv. in Homer) the number of such speeches required of Apollonius would be only 3½. The Argonautica has four, I, 793–833; II, 311–407; III, 320–66; IV, 783–832. And in the case of Quintus, after making similar allowances, one would expect about four. The Posthomerica in fact contains two, V, 181–236, 239–290. Nonnus has 48 speeches which vary in length from 40 to 330 verses. The largest of these are narrative speeches: XI, 356–481; XXXVIII, 105–434; XL, 429–573; XLV, 96–215, and themselves contain long speeches. The upper limit in length of speech for Homer is 260 verses (δ 333–592) according to Schneidewin. Apollonius and Quintus fall far short of this. The longest speech in the Argonautica is 97 verses (II, 311–407); in the Posthomerica 56 verses (V, 181–236). The longest in the Iliad is 172 verses (I 434–605).

[2] Λ 606; Σ 182, 392; Υ 429; Φ 509 (?); Ψ 707, 753, 770; Ω 88.

[3] η 342; θ 358; ι 408; κ 320; λ 80; π 337; ρ 494; χ 491; ω 407, 491, 495. With Ψ 707, 753 cf. Nonnus XXXVII, 552, 620.

TABLE FOR APOLLONIUS.

Book III	.391	Book IV	.256
" II	.328	" I	.200

TABLE FOR QUINTUS.

Book V	.447	Book IX	.206
" III	.311	" XIII	.189
" XII	.298	" VI	.185
" II	.286	" XIV	.178
" VII	.277	" VIII	.170
" X	.246	" IV	.155
" I	.227	" XI	.027

TABLE FOR NONNUS.

Book XXXVIII	.829	Book XXXIX	.432	Book XXIX	.278
" XXVII	.724	" XXXIV	.421	" XVII	.264
" XXXI	.680	" IV	.408	" XXI	.250
" XVI	.617	" II	.405	" V	.236
" XI	.610	" XVIII	.396	" X	.232
" XLVI	.607	" VII	.377	" IX	.224
" VIII	.605	" XXIII	.371	" XXXVII	.183
" XL	.586	" XXIV	.356	" XXXII	.153
" XLV	.541	" III	.355	" XLI	.149
" XLVII	.519	" XLVIII	.338	" VI	.141
" XLIV	.484	" XLIII	.325	" XXVI	.105
" XXXV	.475	" XXX	.325	" XXII	.105
" XX	.472	" XII	.309	" XXV	.094
" XLII	.451	" I	.307	" XIV	.077
" XIX	.449	" XV	.288	" XXVIII	.042
" XXXIII	.441	" XXXVI	.285	" XIII	.030

The general statement may be made for Apollonius and Quintus that the high percentages of speech are coincident with the summit points of interest. The third book of Apollonius has the highest percentage of speech and stands quite above the others in point of dramatic character. It is the core of the poem.

In Quintus the same may be said of the fifth book—it is a summit point of interest in the Posthomerica. Here occurs the ὅπλων κρίσις and the death of Aias. To the speeches of Aias and Odysseus in the debate for the armor of Achilles even the unsympathetic Koechly[1] was constrained to pay tribute. Book X stands well up in the list of percentages, containing as it does the excellent and passionate speeches of Paris and Oenone. In the Iliad the ninth book which is the most dramatic contains the highest percentage of speech.

If the books that contain the lowest percentages of speech are examined a contrary state of affairs will be found. Book XI in the Posthomerica contains only three per cent. speech. It tells of slaying that grows monotonous. So, too, Book VIII with seventeen per cent. abounds in wearisome strife. No book of Homer falls below 19 per cent.; no book of the Iliad below 25 per cent. (M).

The following table presents the substance of the preceding paragraphs.[2]

	1 Number of verses in Epic.	2 Number of verses of Speech.	3 % of Speech.	4 Number of Speeches.	5 Frequency of Occurrence.	6 Average Length of Speech.	7 Longest Speech.	8 Shorte Speech.
Homer..........	27713	13869	50	1311	1 for 21 vv.	10.57 vv.	260 vv.	1 v.
Iliad..........	15693	7040	44	675	1 " 23 "	10.42 "	172 "	1 v.
Odyssey..........	12020	6829	56	636	1 " 19 "	10.73 "	260 "	1 v.
Apollonius.....	5832	1699	29	143	1 " 41 "	11.88 "	97 "	2 vv.
Quintus..........	8786	2073½	24	176	1 " 50 "	11.78 "	56 "	1 v.
Orph. Argo......	1384	170	12	14	1 " 96 "	12.14 "	20 "	6 vv.
Nonnus..........	21279	7611	36	305	1 " 70 "	24.95 "	330 "	2 word
Tryphiodorus...	691	141	20	8	1 " 86 "	17.63 "	41 "	6 vv.
Colluthus........	392	145	37	16	1 " 25 "	9.06 "	25 "	3 vv.
Tzetzes..........	1675	84	5	16	1 "105 "	5.25 "	16 "	1 v.
Vergil............	9892	3862	38	337	1 " 29 "	11.16 "	92 "	......

[1] Proleg. XCVIII: Praeterea duo tantum loci mediocrem tenuitatem superant: Ajacis et Ulixis orationes controversae in libro quinto, et Oenones in Paridem amor et pietas in libro decimo.

[2] Figures for Homer and Vergil excepting those of cols. 5, 8 are taken from Schneidewin.

[3] Speeches within speeches such as Iliad, Z 479 not included.

Among the departmental habits of Greek epic poetry is the marked reluctance to begin or end a speech within a verse. Of the 1311 speeches in Homer only one begins within a verse, Ψ 855 ff. Kvičala,[1] unless he rejects this passage as an interpolation ought to qualify his statement: "Unter den zahlreichen Reden der Ilias und Odyssee findet sich keine einzige deren Anfang nicht mit dem Versanfang zusammenfiele." But something is to be said against this single exception. It is not formally introduced like the rest of the speeches of Homer (excepting Δ 303). Leaf[2] objects to the passage containing the speech in the following terms: "With 798 we begin a long addition absolutely devoid of any poetical merit and standing in the harshest contrast with its surroundings. The three contests contained in 798–883 rival each other in absurdity and obscurity." See also Leaf's note on Δ 303. It therefore does not seem safe to urge Ψ 855 ff. as an instance of an Homeric speech beginning within the verse. There is the same disinclination in Homer to begin or end a speech within a verse in the case of those speeches which occur within others. In 49 instances of such, only one begins within a verse. It is Z 479.

Apollonius is rigidly true to this Greek epic habit, in every instance beginning his speeches at the beginning and ending them at the close of a verse. His contemporary Theocritus in the epic pieces found himself similarly restricted, affording only a single exception in Idyl, XXIV, 67. And yet Callimachus did not hesitate to begin and end a speech within the verse, *e. g.*, the speech of Zeus to Artemis in the Hymn to Artemis, vv. 29–39. Cf. also *Εἰς Δῆλον* 150, 162, 212; *Εἰς Δήμητρα* 42. The Orphic Argonautica does not offer an exception. Quintus shows the force of the tradition but slips in four instances, one case being within a speech, XII, 37–8. One is tempted to think that Quintus was inveigled into these slips by the single case in Homer cited above. For, as Koechly notes on Posthomerica, IV, 408, Quintus undoubtedly had the Homeric description of the

[1] Beiträge zur Erklärung der Aeneis, p. 268.
[2] Iliad II, p. 469 (second edition).

contest of the bow, Ψ 850 ff., in mind when he wrote the description of a similar contest in IV, 405 ff. The three other cases of exceptional beginnings are slight affairs and occurring subsequently to IV, 408–9 may perhaps be regarded as reminiscences of it: XII, 37–8; 254–8; XIV, 602–4. Kvičala[1] wrongly states, therefore, that there is only a single instance in Quintus. He happily observes that Homer would doubtless have extended the introduction to a whole verse, comparing B 271, *ὧδε δέ τις εἴπεσκεν ἰδὼν ἐς πλησίον ἄλλον* and H 178, *ὧδε δέ τις εἴπεσκεν ἰδὼν εἰς οὐρανὸν εὐρύν.* It is certain at any rate that however much Quintus may have been indebted to Vergil, he was not affected by the Roman poet's habit of beginning and ending a speech within a verse. According to Kvičala the Aeneid has 81 speeches which begin within a verse out of 336. A paltry collection of four exceptions in 176 speeches in the Posthomerica affords reasonable ground for believing that in this matter Quintus was under the domination of Greek epic tradition subscribed to or established by Homer and strictly observed by Apollonius of Rhodes.

Several exceptions are to be found in the Dionysiaca of Nonnus: XV, 389; XVI, 145; XLII, 38; XLVIII, 279. In XIII, 485 and XVI, 291 the speech ends within a verse, a practice without the sanction of his predecessors for Iliad, B 70 and O 82 do not offer exact parallels. Kvičala finds that 83 out of a total of 336 speeches in the Aeneid end within a verse. The bits of quoted discourse that occur within speeches in Nonnus offer in addition a dozen instances of exceptional beginnings and endings. But even in Nonnus the violations are trivial and some of these may be accounted for. The exceptional beginnings in XV, 389, 405, 416 are doubtless to be explained by the fact that we have here the license of the pastoral lament. The lament containing XV, 405, 416 is unepic in character. It is comparable departmentally with the Ἐπιτάφιος Ἀδώνιδος of Bion where the speech of Cypris begins within the verse (42). The song of Daphnis in the first idyl of Theocritus has several such: I–77, 82, 97, 100,

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 268.

113. The speeches of Tryphiodorus, Colluthus and Tzetzes are normal.

The Greek epic has perhaps a logical basis for this departmental habit. There was a feeling that the speech should be bounded by the heaviest metrical pauses. By such means the transition from narrative to speech becomes less sudden. The same feeling encouraged the use of such introductory formulas as *τὸν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη*. According to Schmidt,[1] *καί μιν* (*σφεας*) *φωνήσας* (*σασ'*) *ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα* (*-δων*) occurs 51 times. These complexes fill out the verse and prepare for speech. The remarks of Kvičala[2] in this connection are to be noted: "Wie sehr die Griechischen Epiker darauf bedacht waren den Beginn der Rede mit dem Versanfang zusammenfallen zu lassen, zeigt sich in vielen Fällen in dem Streben die einleitende Formel so zu gestalten und durch Zusätze zu erweitern damit der ganze Vers ausgefüllt würde und die Rede mit dem neuen Vers beginnen könnte." Among the examples cited for such additions is H 276–8:

> Ταλθύβιός τε καὶ Ἰδαῖος, πεπνυμένω ἄμφω·
> μέσσῳ δ' ἀμφοτέρων σκῆπτρα σχέθον, εἶπέ τε μῦθον
> κῆρυξ Ἰδαῖος, πεπνυμένα μήδεα εἰδώς·

upon which Kvičala suggestively comments: "Wie sehr hier der Zusatz *πεπνυμένα* überflüssig ist und wie sehr er nur dem erwähnten Zwecke dient lehrt der Umstand dass ja schon 276 *πεπνυμένω ἄμφω* steht was auch auf Idaios geht."

The Vergilian practice of postponing the introductory verb of saying, or thrusting it into the speech itself, combines with the habit of beginning or ending a speech within a verse to point to a less sharply defined feeling as to the objectionableness of a sudden transition from narrative. (Nonnus is capable of postponing the introductory verb in XVI, 291 without Greek epic sanction.) But it may be questioned whether one ought to feel Vergil with Greek epic antennae. The large fact remains interesting that as the subsequent Greek epic adhered to the practice of Homer, so

[1] Parallel-Homer, p. viii. [2] p. 270.

the later Roman epic continued the habit of Vergil, doubtless also inherited, in allowing the speech to begin within the verse.

Standing in contrast with this markedly fixed habit in Greek epic is the fate of antilabae in Greek tragedy. Aeschylus with one exception does not employ this form of stichomythia, therein differing from Sophocles and Euripides.[1]

Worthy of a passing note is the absence from Greek epic speeches of the parenthetic verb of saying. It would not suit the dignity of epic. It is a nuisance in Plato.[2] In the Symposium 190 c in a directly recorded speech of Zeus the parenthetic ἔφη occurs. The instance in the epic idyl of Theocritus, XXVI, 19, where ἔειπε is used is a slight affair.

The Homeric practice of introducing speech within speech has a curious history in later epic and serves to illustrate how in some points the Homeric model seems completely to have been neglected. There are 49 speeches of various kinds occurring within speeches in Homer.[3] In the Odyssey the type of included speech announced by such phrases as *καί νύ τις ὧδ' εἴπῃσιν* (ζ 275) and *μήποτέ τις εἴπῃσιν* (φ 324) is represented by these two cases alone, though frequently employed in the Iliad.

Apollonius has not a single instance of a speech within a speech, although he has created opportunities for it in I, 1338 and IV, 1352–6 where the words of the goddesses might have been inserted in the direct form of IV, 1324–8. Among the epic pieces of Theocritus there is one example, XXII, 154–66, where Lynkeus gives in the direct form a speech of his own on a previous occasion. Quintus has only a single instance of direct

[1] v. Gross, *De Stichomythiae in Tragoedia Comoediaque Graecorum Usu et Origine* (1904), p. 14.

[2] v. Theaetetus 143 c.

[3] Those in the Iliad are: Β 60–70, 323–9; Δ 178–81; Ζ 164–5, 460–1, 479; Η 89–90, 301–2; Θ 149; Ι 254–8; Λ 786–9; Μ 318–21; Π 203–6; 839–41; Τ 101–5, 107–11, 121–4; Χ 107, 498; Ψ 576–8. The case in Η 89–90:

> ἀνδρὸς μὲν τόδε σῆμα πάλαι κατατεθνηῶτος
> ὅν ποτ' ἀριστεύοντα κατέκτανε φαίδιμος Ἕκτωρ.

is perhaps the best Homeric warrant for the bits of epic epigraphy directly recorded in Nonnus, *e. g.*, XI, 473–4; XV, 360–1; XVII, 313–4; XXXVII, 101–2; XLVI, 318–9—all two verses in length.

discourse within a speech and this does not admit of comparison with the Homeric types cited above. It is a shift from the indirect to the direct form of discourse. In XII, 25–45, Odysseus bids the Argives build a horse, conceal several of their number within it and depart for Tenedos, leaving some one behind (vv. 35–8):

> *ὅστις ὑποκρίναιτο βίην ὑπέροπλον Ἀχαιῶν*
> *ῥέξαι ὑπὲρ νόστοιο λιλαιομένων μέγ' ἀλύξαι*
> *ἵππῳ ὑποπτήξας εὐεργέϊ· "τὸν δ' ἐκάμοντο*
> *Παλλάδι χωομένῃ Τρώων ὕπερ αἰχμητάων."*

The absence of such speeches receives little explanation from the fact that Quintus shares the later epic reluctance to repeat, preferring the less effective means of oratio obliqua; *e. g.*, XIV, 235–45, after XIV, 185–222; cf. Homer, *β* 96–102, *τ* 141–7, *ω* 131–7; *δ* 333–50, *ρ* 124–41. For some reason Quintus like Apollonius and unlike Nonnus failed to inherit the Homeric habit of introducing brief speeches within speeches with such phrases as *καί ποτέ τις εἴπῃσιν*, etc. Strangely enough in Nonnus there is a return to the use of these short speeches, and 35 cases are to be gathered from the Dionysiaca, 22 consisting of a single verse or less. The impression, however, which they produce in Nonnus is one of monotony. They are too frequently employed. One finds *ὄφρα τις εἴπῃ* in II, 303; VIII, 249; XV, 284, 345; XXI, 39; XXX, 184; XXXIII, 261; XLVI, 174; XLVIII, 548. Other forms of introduction are *ὅταν . . . τις ἐνίψῃ*, VIII, 89; *ὅπως . . . βοήσω*, XI, 29; *καί τις ἐνίψῃ*, XXXIX, 142; *μή τις ἐνίψῃ*, XL, 155; *βοήσατε*, XLVIII, 559; *εἴπατε*, XLVIII, 802. A form that is happily without the sanction of Homer is *ἀλλ' ἐρέεις*: XL, 25, 545; XLV, 92, 170; XLVII, 433. The monotony of the direct discourse after these forms is aggravated by their use also with the indirect expression: *ἀλλ' ἐρέεις ὅτι*, IV, 188; VI, 356; XLV, 82, and *ὄφρα τις εἴπῃ . . . ὅτι*: XX, 316; XLVIII, 26, and *ὅταν . . . τις ἐνίψῃ ὅττι*, XX, 366. Rarely in Homer is the indirect form employed as in *τ* 121, *ψ* 135. Tryphiodorus has no examples of such speeches. There is an instance in Colluthus of the direct form introduced by *εἴπατε* in vv. 385–6.

The speakers in the different epic poems afford some interesting and suggestive comparisons. The speeches in Homer are delivered by either god or man with the single exception of the one by Xanthus, the horse of Achilles, to Achilles in T 408 ff. where the poet takes care to say (v. 407): *αὐδήεντα δ' ἔθηκε θεὰ λευκώλενος Ἥρη*. One might also consider in this connection Π 150: *τοὺς (Χάνθον καὶ Βαλίον) ἔτεκε Ζεφύρῳ ἀνέμῳ Ἅρπυια Ποδάργη*. To the feeling of Oppian such a speech did not seem out of place. Perhaps he had the speech of Xanthus in mind when he wrote (Cynegetica, I 226–8):

> *ἵππος ἐν ὑσμίνῃ ῥῆξεν ποτὲ δεσμὰ σιωπῆς,*
> *καὶ φύσιος θεσμοὺς ὑπερέδραμε καὶ λάβεν ἠχὴν*
> *ἀνδρομέην καὶ γλῶσσαν ὁμοίïον ἀνθρώποισιν.*

The speeches by the rivers in Φ are no sooner mentioned than disposed of. Personification (Φ 213, *ἀνέρι εἰσάμενος*) or deification (Φ 223, *Σκάμανδρε διοτρεφές*) is a ready means. In the Odyssey, τ 546–50, there is a speech by an eagle recorded in the direct form within the speech of Penelope, but the exception is modified by vv. 548–9:

> *ἐγὼ δέ τοι αἰετὸς ὄρνις*
> *ἦα πάρος, νῦν αὖτε τεὸς πόσις εἰλήλουθα.*

There is the further qualifying circumstance that Penelope heard this speech in a dream. One may note here that Euphemus in the Argonautica, IV, 1732 ff., records hearing in a dream a speech by a daughter of Triton who appeared from a lump of earth (v. 1736).

The speeches in the Argonautica are spoken by divinities and persons with the single exception of III, 932–7, where a crow speaks. The passage[1] is as follows (vv. 927–39):

> *Ἔστι δέ τις πεδίοιο κατὰ στίβον ἐγγύθι νηοῦ*
> *αἴγειρος φύλλοισιν ἀπειρεσίοις κομόωσα,*
> *τῇ θαμὰ δὴ λακέρυζαι ἐπηυλίζοντο κορῶναι.*

[1] Cf. Nonnus, III, 97 ff.

τάων τις μεσσηγὺς ἀνὰ πτερὰ κινήσασα
ὑψοῦ ἐπ' ἀκρεμόνων Ἥρης ἠνίπαπε βουλάς·
"Ἀκλειὴς ὅδε μάντις, ὃς οὐδ' ὅσα παῖδες ἴσασιν
οἶδε νόῳ φράσσασθαι, ὁθούνεκεν οὔτε τι λαρὸν
οὔτ' ἐρατὸν κούρῃ κεν ἔπος προτιμυθήσαιτο
ἠιθέῳ, εὖτ' ἄν σφιν ἐπήλυδες ἄλλοι ἕπωνται.
ἔρροις, ὦ κακόμαντι, κακοφραδές· οὔτε σε Κύπρις,
οὔτ' ἀγανοὶ φιλέοντες ἐπιπνείουσιν Ἔρωτες."
Ἴσκεν ἀτεμβομένη· μείδησε δὲ Μόψος ἀκούσας
ὀμφὴν οἰωνοῖο θεήλατον, ὧδε τ' ἔειπεν·

Here Apollonius, the imitator of Homer, has apparently violated Homeric precedent for *τ* 546–50 may not be cited as a comfortable illustration of speaking by birds, prophetic or not. The personality of Odysseus is there blended with the eagle. The solitariness of the exception in Apollonius leads one to examine it in the hope to discover special warrant. The hope is confirmed when one notices the evident care which Apollonius has taken to give speeches to gods and men alone. For in IV, 585–91 the words of prophecy and command uttered by the oaken beam of the ship Argo are recorded indirectly in spite of its divine endowment as *αὐδῆεν*. This may fairly be construed to indicate a reluctance on the part of Apollonius to assign direct speech to the non-personal—a reluctance better appreciated when it is noted that the author of the Orphic Argonautica introduces the same oaken beam as speaking in the direct form, vv. 1164–74. Apollonius felt the restrictions of the older epic; the author of the Orphic Argonautica was less sensible of them.

The exceptional character of the speech by a crow is hardly warranted by the fact that the divinations of Mopsus were so much a matter of ornithoscopy as to have given rise to the tradition recorded by Clemens Alexandrinus[1]: *Δωρόθεός τε ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ Πανδέκτῃ Ἀλκυόνος καὶ Κορώνης ἐπακοῦσαι τὸν Μόψον ἱστορεῖ*—nor again by the story told in Hesiod[2]: *τῷ μὲν ἄρ'*

[1] Strom., I, 334.
[2] Frag. 148 (Rzach); v. Schol. ad Pind., *Pyth.*, III, 48; Frazer, *Pausanias*, III, 72, s. v. Coronis.

ἄγγελος ἦλθε κόραξ ἱερῆς ἀπὸ δαιτὸς | Πυθὼ ἐς ἠγαθέην, φράσσεν δ' ἄρα ἔργ' ἀΐδηλα | Φοίβῳ ἀκερσεκόμῃ, ὅτ' ἄρ' Ἴσχυς ἔγημε Κόρωνιν | Εἰλατίδης, Φλεγύαο διογνήτοιο θύγατρα.

The passage containing a crow's words to the seer Mopsus has been felt to be a bit of literary evidence for the quarrel between Apollonius and Callimachus. Merkel suspected that some relation exists between this speech and that of *φθόνος* in v. 106 of the hymn to Apollo by Callimachus. His words[1] are as follows: "Versus hymni in Apollonium scriptos mihi constat hoc argumento quod in ipsis Argonauticis locus est ambigue in adversarium sed manifesta versus Callimachei *οὐκ ἄγαμαι τὸν ἀοιδὸν ὃς οὐδ' ὅσα πόντος ἀείδει* parodia compositus Γ 932: *ἀκλειὴς ὅδε μάντις, ὃς οὐδ' ὅσα παῖδες ἴσασιν | οἶδε νόῳ φράσασθαι* et quae ad versum usque 937 sequuntur." Referring to the passage in the Argonautica, Gercke[2] says: "Da Kallimachos und Theokrit diese Stelle vor Augen gehabt haben ist es kaum fraglich dass man die Zielscheibe des Spottes in ihrem Kreise suchen darf; keinesfalls hat aber Apollonios sich selbst gegeisselt was man aus seinen Worten hat herauslesen wollen. Dies ist die einzige Stelle welche aus dem schlichten Gange der Erzählung völlig herausfällt und läppisch sein würde, wenn sie nicht polemisch wäre." The passage has since, however, been taken at its face value by De La Ville De Mirmont.[3] Gercke's further remarks must also be cited: "Trotzdem ist eine nachträgliche Einschiebung vieler Stellen nicht erweislich, da mit Ausnahme der Mopsos Episode überhaupt keine Störung des Zusammenhanges stattfindet und selbst diese eine Ausnahme bis vor kurzem noch nicht anerkannt war: es ist daher viel wahrscheinlicher, dass die ganzen späteren Bücher erst gedichtet sind, als Apollonios schon Spott und Hohn von allen Seiten hatte hören müssen und nun theils sich zurückzuziehen theils sich zu rächen beschloss."

The passage in Apollonius is unusual in epic, and contains a covert contribution to the bitter literary quarrel of Callimachus and his pupil. Now, in the lost poem of Callimachus, the Ibis,

[1] Proleg., XVIII. [2] Rh. M. 44 (1889), 251.
[3] *Apollonios de Rhodes et Virgile* (1894), pp. 201–2.

one learns from Suidas[1] that Apollonius was the object of a severe attack under the name of Ibis: *Ἶβις· ἔστι δὲ ποίημα ἐπιτετηδευμένον εἰς ἀσάφειαν καὶ λοιδορίαν εἴς τινα Ἶβιν γενόμενον ἐχθρὸν τοῦ Καλλιμάχου. ἦν δὲ οὗτος ὁ Ἀπολλώνιος ὁ γράψας τὰ Ἀργοναυτικά.* With this in mind one may proceed to the significance of the name Ibis which has been compactly set forth by Ellis[2]: "Nam Apollonius quamquam plerumque et in utraque vita Alexandrinus vocatur, Athenaeo teste 283 ab aliis Naucratites habitus est. At in Naucrati, quod erat oppidum Aegypti non longe distans Alexandria ab oriente fuisse olim deum quendam antiquum Theuth nomine cui sacra avis Ibis dicata fuerit, confirmat Plato in Phaedro 274 C: unde Naucratica potissimum avis et Apollonii civis Ibis fuit. Hinc praecipue rivale nomen Ibidis imposuisse Callimachum reor; nec dubito ut volucrem, sic Mercurium sive Theuth, cui ea sacra fuit, partes in diris eius habuisse."

Now it is tentatively suggested that the speech by a crow in the Argonautica is to be associated with the savage attack upon Apollonius by Callimachus in his poem the Ibis. A speech by Ibis in the poem of Callimachus would give considerable significance to a speech by a crow in the Argonautica for just as Callimachus chose the bird name ibis to designate Apollonius, so the latter employed *κορώνη* to indicate his rival because *κορώνη* would as readily suggest Κυρήνη whence Callimachus came. *κορώνη* is the bird sacred to Apollo and is called the child of Apollo in *Athen.* 8, p. 359 e.[3] Apollo is the founder and god par excellence of Cyrene. The fourth and fifth Pythian odes of Pindar show this. There was a famous oracle of Apollo at Cyrene which was really the making of the city (v. Pindar, *Pyth.*, IV, 53). The port of Cyrene was called Apollonia. But the allusions to Cyrene and its founding by Apollo which Callimachus makes in his hymn to Apollo are of far greater import for us. They give additional point to the veiled reference to Callimachus

[1] s. v. Καλλίμαχος.

[2] *P. Ovidii Nasonis Ibis*, p. xxxiii.

[3] v. Frazer, *l. c.* Athenaeus quoting Phoenix of Colophon: *κορώνῃ . . . . τῃ παιδὶ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος.* Schol. ad Aristoph. Nub. 133: *κόρακας, τοὺς τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος ἱερούς.* Plut. Isis et Osir. 71; Ael. Nat. An. 1. 48.

which is thought to be contained in the word *κορώνη* (*κορῶναι*). The hymn to Apollo with these allusions, recently written in the time of Apollonius must have been fresh in the minds of contemporary literary men interested in the works of the parties to the quarrel and have enabled them to feel the personality of *κορώνη*; for they were already aware of the process by which Callimachus had arrived at the word ibis as a name for his rival, and after the recent emphasis by Callimachus of the connection of Cyrene with the crow and Apollo, they would also see how Apollonius in retaliation arrived at the name *κορώνη* for Callimachus. The passages from the hymn may now be cited:

(1) vv. 65–8 *Φοῖβος καὶ βαθύγειον ἐμὴν πόλιν ἔφρασε Βάττῳ*
καὶ Λιβύην ἐσιόντι κόραξ ἡγήσατο λαῷ
δεξιὸς οἰκιστήρ, καὶ ὤμοσε τείχεα δώσειν
ἡμετέροις βασιλεῦσιν.

(2) vv. 72–3 *Σπάρτη τοι, Καρνεῖε, τό γε πρώτιστον ἔδεθλον*
δεύτερον αὖ Θήρη, τρίτατόν γε μὲν ἄστυ Κυρήνης.

(3) vv. 94–6 *οὐδὲ πόλει τόσ' ἔνειμεν ὀφέλσιμα, τόσσα Κυρήνῃ*
μνωόμενος προτέρης ἁρπακτύος· οὐδὲ μὲν αὐτοὶ
Βαττιάδαι Φοίβοιο πλέον θεὸν ἄλλον ἔτισαν.

So *κορώνη* becomes a Callimachi civis and the following parallel may be set down:

Naucratis	Theuth	ibis	Apollonius
Cyrene	Apollo	crow	Callimachus.[1]

Whatever the origin of the name Κυρήνη may be, whether it is really connected as Bechtel[2] thinks with *κορωνίς*, popular etymology tempted by the tradition that a crow had a part in the founding of Cyrene[3] might readily have derived Κυρήνη from

[1] I am indebted to Dr. D. M. Robinson of the Johns Hopkins University, and to Dr. T. L. Shear of Barnard College for their coöperation in the elaboration of this theory.

[2] v. Gercke, *Hermes*, XLI (1906), p. 456; Frazer, *l. c.*

[3] v. Hymn to Apollo, v. 66, cited above. Ernesti (1761), *ad. loc.*: "*κόραξ*-refertur ad ipsum Apollinem." Gercke, *l. c.*: "Der eigentliche Stadtgründer ist Apollon oder sein Vogel der Rabe (wenn nicht die Krähe)."

κορώνη. The possibility of such derivation would be enhanced by the similarity in sound of the two words. This similarity, whether or not there was such a folk etymology current in the time of Apollonius, may have been regarded by him as a very happy coincidence and have determined his choice of the word *κορώνη* instead of *κόραξ* which is employed by Callimachus in the hymn to Apollo. *λακέρυζα* is also an epithet of *κορώνη*, Hes. Op. 747, Ar. Av. 609. Aside from being suggestive of the native city of Callimachus and ultimately of Callimachus himself, the word *κορώνη* would seem to be suggestive too of a literary rival. The Pindaric precedent, to be discussed subsequently, of referring to rivals as crows may well have been in the mind of Apollonius.

The suggestion, therefore, hangs over the passage that the *λακέρυζαι κορῶναι* in III, 929 are the *Περικαλλίμαχοι*; while at the chief of the school, Callimachus, a thrust is made in v. 930, *τάων τις μεσσηγὺς ἀνὰ πτερὰ κινήσασα*. To test the suggestion by attempting to follow it out into details and see a double significance in the speech itself is demanding perhaps more than the poet intended. It may not be demanded of polemic in the higher ranges of poetry that it be conspicuously such. Still one is tempted to see in the speech a reference to the literary exile of Apollonius that followed the failure of the Argonautica at Alexandria (*ἀκλειὴς ὅδε μάντις .... ἔρροις*), while in the smile of the seer Mopsus is mirrored the later success of the poet (*μείδησε δὲ Μόψος ἀκούσας*). That Apollonius intended Theocritus to be numbered among the *λακέρυζαι κορῶναι* is suggested by a comparison of Apollonius, III 927 and Theocritus, VII 8–9.

Ap. Rh., III 927 *αἴγειρος φύλλοισιν ἀπειρεσίοις κομόωσα*

Theoc., VII 8–9 *αἴγειροι κλῆθραί τε εὔσκιον ἄλσος ἔφαινον*
χλωροῖσιν πετάλοισι κατηρεφέες κομόωσαι.

Gercke felt some intimacy to exist between the two, and a Theocritean background would not be out of place.

The use of the word crow as a designation of literary rivals has precedent in Pindar. Jebb[1] observes: "It is indisputable

[1] Bacchylides (1905), p. 14.

that several passages of Pindar express scorn for some people who are compared to crows or daws, to apes or foxes. The only question is, are all such utterances merely general, referring to classes of persons, such, for instance, as the vulgar herd of inferior poets? Or is the allusion in such places, or in any of them, to individuals?" For the dual of γαρύετον of the passage to be cited immediately from Pindar, Jebb can see no explanation except in the assumption that thereby two definite persons are indicated. According to the Alexandrian commentator, Simonides and Bacchylides are the persons. Apollonius, therefore, had before him precedent in poetry for polemic directed toward specific rivals which was appreciated as such by his contemporaries.

In Pindar, *Olym.*, II, 94–7, are these words:

> *σοφὸς ὁ πολλὰ ϝειδὼς φυᾷ*
> *μαθόντες δὲ λάβροι*
> *παγγλωσίᾳ, κόρακες ὥς, ἄκραντα γαρύετον*
> *Διὸς πρὸς ὄρνιχα θεῖον.*

translated thus by Jebb[1]: "The bard is he whose mind is rich by nature's gift; men shaped by lore have sound and fury effecting nought; 'tis the chattering of crows against the godlike bird of Zeus." Verrall[2] suggests a reference to the two Sicilian rhetoricians Korax and Tisias. In *Nem.*, III, 80 ff., is another illustration:

> *ἔστι δ' αἰετὸς ὠκὺς ἐν ποτανοῖς*
> *ὃς ἔλαβεν αἶψα, τηλόθε μεταμαιόμενος δαφοινὸν ἄγραν ποσίν*
> *κραγέται δὲ κολοιοὶ ταπεινὰ νέμονται.*

on which Bury remarks: "These words like many others in Pindar are charged with a two-fold meaning; they refer apparently to the victor and covertly to the poet—to the Aeginetan, as well as to the Theban eagle. Pindar is the eagle and his rivals are daws. The strange word *κραγέται* invented by the poet is not, I think, without significance. It strongly suggests

[1] *J. H. S.*, III, 161. [2] *Jour. of Phil.*, IX, 130.

'Κράγας ('Ακράγας) daws of Acragas. . . . We are thus led to conclude that Pindar referred to some Sicilian rivals associated with the city of Agrigentum."

When we learn that Theocritus, VII, 45 ff., was courting favor with Callimachus in thus assailing the latter's rival, Apollonius[1]:

> *ὥς μοι καὶ τέκτων μέγ' ἀπέχθεται ὅστις ἐρευνῇ*
> *ἶσον ὄρευς κορυφᾷ τελέσαι δόμον εὐρυμέδοντος,*
> *καὶ Μοισᾶν ὄρνιχες ὅσοι ποτὶ Χῖον ἀοιδόν*
> *ἀντία κοκκύζοντες ἐτώσια μοχθίζοντι.*

we are the more confirmed in our suspicion that Apollonius attached special significance to the passage under discussion. Speaking of Theocritus and Apollonius, Gercke[2] says: "Weiter finden sich nicht nur in Thematen und Bildern sondern auch in einzelnen Wendungen eine Fülle von Uebereinstimmungen zwischen dem Epiker und dem Bukoliker welches den Gedanken an einen Zufall vollkommen ausschliessen." But absolute certainty cannot be given to the claim which Gercke next puts forth: "Da Theokrit der ältere, anerkannte Meister war müsste man erwarten, Apollonios häufig auf seinen Spuren zu betreffen. In Wirklichkeit ergiebt sich aber da, wo sich die Priorität noch erschliessen lässt dass Theokrit die Verse des Anfängers vor Augen gehabt und an ihnen seine meist launige Kritik geübt hat. Am schlagendsten lässt sich diese Stellung beider Dichter zu einander wohl einer Stelle der Thalysien zeigen."

In conclusion the admission has to be made that the absence of an exact chronology for the various literary evidences of the quarrel between Callimachus and Apollonius makes it impossible to affirm the sequence above tentatively proposed. It cannot be said with certainty that the passage in Apollonius antedated the Ἶβις of Callimachus or *vice versa.* It is possible also to deny to them any intimate connection and to regard them as isolated contributions to the quarrel. The conviction, however, that we have in the passage in the Argonautica a bit of polemic tinges the

[1] v. Christ[4], *Griech. Lit.*, p. 540. [2] Rh. M. 44, 137.

speech of the crow with personality and thereby modifies its exceptional character. Whether this bit of polemic is unbecoming epic is another matter. Jebb[1], in alluding to the reluctance of moderns to believe that a great poet like Pindar could have dealt in such innuendo as above instanced, has remarked happily: "It is hardly needful to say that modern standards of feeling cannot safely be applied to an age of which the tone in such matters was so different."

In the Posthomerica all speakers are either divinities or persons. Like Apollonius, Nonnus has a speech by a crow, III, 103–22. In both cases the crows flap their wings. Again, in the Dionysiaca the direct utterance of dogs and of a hill is recorded in v. 459–60 and 462–6 within the speech by the shade of Aktaeon. The λίθος of Niobe speaks in XIV, 274–82. Oak trees speak a verse and a half in XV, 389–90. The lament which the cow seems to utter in XV, 398–418 is another instance. Objection may be urged against it on the ground of the introductory words, v. 397, *ἔοικε δὲ τοῦτο βοῆσαι*, but the passage is speech in effect. In XVI, 290, *ἄμπελος* gives forth an *Ὑμὴν Ὑμέναιε*, and in the following verse *ὀρεστιὰς πεύκη* cries *ἱμερόεις γάμος οὗτος* where the postposition of the verb of saying deserves a passing notice. In XX, 137–41 are the words of *πίθος*, speech in effect but introduced by vv. 135–6:

καὶ εἰ βροτέην λάχε φωνήν,
τοῖον ἔπος Σατύροισιν ἐρεύγετο κῶμον ἀκούων.

Ambrosia, who had been changed into a *φυτόν* and made *αὐδῆεν* by Rhea, speaks in XXI, 36–52. In XXXVIII, 333–46 *ἀστήρ* becomes excited at the reckless driving of Phaethon and bids him spare his whip. From a survey of these passages, the conclusion is formed that Nonnus had a debased feeling for the epic speech. He has not observed the Homeric limitations as to speakers.

Equally interesting is a comparison of the epic poets with reference to the objects spoken to. Speeches in the Iliad addressed to other than divinities and persons are confined to

[1] *Op. cit.*, 14.

horses and rivers—the latter forming no exception at all. In Θ 185 Hector speaks to his horses as does Antilochus in Ψ 403. One may note in the Odyssey the speech of Polyphemus to the ram, ι 447. The comment on this passage in Ameis-Hentze (Anhang) is suggestive: "In solchen Stimmungen scheint der Lieblingsgegenstand momentan von Geist beseelt mit dem Menschen zu sympathisieren. Wie hier Polyphemus mit seinem Leitbock redet, so anderwärts ein Held mit seinen Rossen. . . ." The speech of Odysseus in υ 18–21 to his *κραδίη* stands on the same plane with those speeches frequently introduced by *εἶπε πρὸς ὃν μεγαλήτορα θυμόν.*

The speeches in Apollonius and Quintus are spoken to divinities and persons. In v, 441–8 of the Posthomerica, Aias in his madness speaks to a slain ram, but as he supposes it to be Odysseus his speech may not be cited as an exception. In this regard as in the one just mentioned Nonnus takes liberties. He has his characters address *κωφὸν ὕδωρ, ῥηγμῖνες ἀναυδέες*, I, 128 ff.; *βροντή*, VIII, 270 ff.; *ταῦρος*, XI, 197 ff.; *κύων*, XVI, 191 ff. In II, 258 ff. Typhos makes an appeal to the might of his arms[1]: *χεῖρες ἐμαί, Διὸς οἶκον ἀράξατε.* Worthy of a passing note is the speech of Orontes in XXIII, 65–9:

> *γαστήρ, δέχνυσο τοῦτο φίλον ξίφος· αἰδέομαι γάρ,*
> *μή τις ἐμὲ κτείνειεν ἀνάρσιος ἀπτόλεμος χείρ.*
> *αὐτὸς ἐμῷ κενεῶνι θελήμονα χαλκὸν ἐλάσσω,*
> *μή με πατὴρ μέμψαιτο δεδουπότα θήλεϊ θύρσῳ,*
> *μὴ Σάτυρον, μὴ Βάκχον ἐμὸν καλέσειε φονῆα.*

This speech gives one sufficient warrant for believing that if Nonnus had written the Posthomerica he would have had Aias the suicide, in v, 483 ff., deliver a speech to *αὐχήν* before it received the *Ἑκτόρεον ξίφος.* The presence of a speech in the one case and the absence of one in the other is a note on the different conceptions of the two poets as to the proper objects to be addressed in epic speeches. The speeches of Tryphiodorus

[1] Cf. Soph. Philoctetes, 1004; v. Jebb on v. 1354.

offer no occasion for comment in this regard. In Colluthus, vv. 383–6, Hermione speaks to the birds.

In connection with the subject of the persons addressed in epic speeches, the manner of the address may properly suggest itself. The use of the vocative in Homer and Apollonius has already been investigated with suggestive results.[1] It remains to examine the vocatives in Quintus and see how they compare with the vocative in the studies mentioned above—the comparison being made chiefly with the phenomena in the Iliad. The vocatives in the Posthomerica have been divided into two general classes according as they are employed with or without the interjection ὦ.

Vocatives Without ὦ.[2]

ἆ δείλ', III, 253; VI, 414.
ἆ δείλ' Ἀτρέος υἱέ, VI, 41.
ἆ δειλή, I, 100.
ἆ δειλοί, VIII, 256; XI, 217.
ἆ δειλοὶ καὶ ἄναλκιν ἐνὶ φρεσὶ θυμὸν ἔχοντες, VII, 513.
ἆ δειλοὶ Τρῶες καὶ Δάρδανοι, III, 167.
ἀγλαὰ τέκνα, IV, 266 (2–3).
Αἶαν, III, 246; V, 239 (+ ἀμετροεπές), 307, 509 (+ καρτερόθυμε).
Αἰνεία, XI, 491. Cf. XI, 137.
ἀλιτρέ, X, 322 (2–3).
ἄνερ, X, 392.
Ἀργεῖοι, VI, 443 (2–3); XIII, 274.
Ἀργείων σκηπτοῦχε, III, 518.
γεραιέ, XII, 280 (2–3).
δειλαίη, I, 645.
Εὐρύμαχ' Αἰνεία τε, XI, 137.
Εὐρύπυλ', VI, 426; VIII, 211.

[1] J. A. Scott, "The Vocative in Homer and Hesiod." *A. J. P.*, XXIV (1903), 192–6; B. L. Gildersleeve and C. W. E. Miller, "The Vocative in Apollonios Rhodios." *ibid.* 197–9.

[2] The numbers in parenthesis indicate the foot or feet of the verse in which the vocative occurs. When no numbers are given the instance occurs at the beginning of the verse.

Ζεῦ, IX, 9; XIV, 119 (2).
Ζεῦ πάτερ, III, 499; IV, 49 (+ ἀργικέραυνε); VIII, 431; IX, 17; XIV, 427.
θεὰ Θέτι, III, 633 (3–4).
θεὰ μεγάθυμε (Athena), XII, 153 (1–3).
θεηγενέες βασιλῆες, VI, 9 (3–6).
θεράποντες, VIII, 15 (2–3).
κύδιμα τέκνα φιλοπτολέμων Ἀργείων, XIII, 506 (2–6).
κύον, V, 444 (1–2).
Μενέλαε, XIII, 409 (2–3).
μῆτερ ἐμεῖο, VII, 288 (2–3).
Μοῦσαι, XII, 306 (6).
νέοι ἄνδρες, IV, 297 (2–3).
νήπιε, III, 125.
πάτερ (Zeus), I, 186 (1–2).
πάτερ (Achilles) (1–2), IX, 50; XIV, 308.
Πηλείδη (2–3), III, 40, 493.
πότνα (Oenone), X, 304 (3).
Πουλυδάμα, II, 68; X, 27.
Πριαμίδη, IX, 248.
Πριαμίδη μεγάθυμε, VI, 309.
σχέτλιαι, I, 452.
σχέτλιε, I, 733; II, 414; V, 211; X, 318.
σχέτλιοι, XII, 544.
σχέτλιος, III, 114; VI, 388; v. Koechly on III, 114.
τέκνον, VII, 262, 298 (3); XIV, 295 (+ ἐμόν).
τέκος (1–2), VII, 659; XIV, 185.
Τυδείδη, IV, 89.
φίλα τέκνα (2–3), XII, 261.
φίλα τέκνα μενεπτολέμων Ἀργείων (2–6), VI, 59; XIV, 235.
φίλε τέκνον (2–3), II, 609; III, 463; X, 373.
φίλοι (1–2), IX, 275; XIV, 338.
φίλον τέκος, XIV, 300 (3–4).
Φοῖβε, III, 46, 98.
ὤμοι ἐπιχθονίων πάντων ὀλοώτατε φωτῶν, II, 87; 78 cases.

Vocatives with ὦ.

ὦ Ἀγάμεμνον, vii, 701 (2–3).
ὦ ἄνα, ix, 227.
ὦ Ἀχιλεῦ, i, 497.
ὦ Ἀχιλεῦ, μέγα ἕρκος ἐυσθενέων Ἀργείων, ii, 390; iii, 435.
ὦ Ἀχιλεῦ, φρένας αἰνέ, i, 723.
ὦ γέρον, ii, 309; v, 166; vii, 668; xii, 298; xiii, 199, 238.
ὦ γύναι, i, 575; v, 560.
ὦ γύναι αἰδοίη, x, 284.
ὦ Θρασύμηδες ἀγακλεές, ii, 268 (2–4).
ὦ Κάλχαν, xii, 67.
ὦ κλυτοὶ Ἀργείων σημάντορες, viii, 452; xii, 220 (+ ὀβριμόθυμοι).
ὦ κούρη Πριάμοιο, xii, 553.
ὦ κύνες, i, 326.
ὦ κύον, iii, 344; ix, 261; x, 226; xiii, 359.
ὦ Μέμνον, ii, 127, 320, 431.
ὦ Μενέλαε (2–3), v, 428; xiv, 155.
ὦ Νέστορ, xii, 275.
ὦ ξεῖνοι, vii, 179.
ὦ Ὀδυσεῦ δολομῆτα καὶ ἀργαλεώτατε πάντων, v, 292.
ὦ Ὀδυσεῦ καὶ πάντες Ἀχαιῶν φέρτατοι υἷες, xii, 247.
ὦ Ὀδυσεῦ μέγ' ὄνειαρ ἐυσθενέων Ἀργείων, vi, 85.
ὦ Ὀδυσεῦ φρένας αἰνέ. v, 181.
ὦ πάτερ, vii, 58.
ὦ τέκος, vii, 39, 690; xiv, 444 (Athena).
ὦ τέκος ἐσθλὸν Ἀχιλλέος, vii, 642 (2–4).
ὦ τέκος ὀβριμόθυμον, vii, 294.
ὦ τέκος ὀβριμόθυμον ἀτάρβεος Αἰακίδαο, xii, 74.
ὦ τέκος ὀβριμόθυμον ἐυπτολέμου Ἀχιλῆος, xiii, 226.
ὦ φίλ', ix, 491; xii, 25.
ὦ φίλαι, i, 409.
ὦ φίλοι, i, 358, ii, 10; iii, 190; iv, 83, 303, 490; v, 141, 574, 601; vi, 72, 604; vii, 422; ix, 85; x, 10; xii, 52.
ὦ φίλος, iv, 103; ix, 518.
ὦ φίλος ἠδ' ἄλλοι Τρῶες σθεναροί τ' ἐπίκουροι, ii, 27; 65 cases.

From this collection of examples which is thought to be complete, it is seen that there is a marked increase in the use of the vocative with ὦ over that in the Iliad. According to Scott, *l. c.*, ὦ is employed 73 times in the Iliad, while in 628 instances of the vocative the interjection is not employed. The Posthomerica has 65 cases of the vocative with the interjection ὦ and 78 cases without. Thus, in the Iliad one vocative in ten has ὦ; in the Posthomerica, one in two. In spite of this increase Quintus shows a conspicuous respect for certain Homeric regulations as to the use of the vocative with the interjection. The old epic θεσμός excluded ὦ from prayers and speeches directed to the gods. Scott attributes this exclusion to the familiar tone of ὦ, believing that metrical reasons cannot explain the non-occurrence in Homer of such phrases as: ὦ Ζεῦ, ὦ θεοί, ὦ Κρονίδη, ὦ θύγατερ Διός, ὦ Μοῦσαι, ὦ γαιήοχε κυανοχαῖτα, ὦ Θέμι, ὦ Φοῖβ', ὦ Θέτι.

The prohibition against the use of the interjection with the names of the gods is violated by Apollonius in two trivial instances only IV 1411, 1414:

δαίμονες ὦ καλαὶ καὶ εὔφρονες, ἵλατ', ἄνασσαι

. . . .

ὦ νύμφαι, ἱερὸν γένος Ὠκεανοῖο

Quintus has no case in which individuals appealing or speaking to the gods employ the vocative with ὦ. Cases of such appeal without ὦ are as follows: Ζεῦ IX, 9; XIV, 119; Ζεῦ πάτερ III, 499; IX, 17; θεὰ μεγάθυμε (Athena) XII, 153; πάτερ (Zeus) I, 186; Φοῖβε III, 46, 98; in XII, 306 Μοῦσαι occurs without ὦ.

In the Iliad the interjection is never added to a patronymic directly. Several metrically possible combinations of ὦ with the patronymic are set down by Scott. Apollonius does not use the two together and the same restriction obtains in Quintus who uses Πηλείδη in III, 40, 493; Τυδείδη IV, 89; Πριαμίδη VI, 309; IX, 248.

Scott finds that no woman uses the interjection ὦ in Homer. This is not true of Apollonius: I, 657; III, 891. In the Posthomerica there are three instances, two of which may be accounted

for. Penthesilea begins her haughty threat to the Greeks with ὦ κύνες, I, 326. Tisiphone opens her exhortation to the Trojan women in I, 409, with ὦ φίλαι. The women in both cases are out of the sphere proper to woman and concerning themselves with deeds that belong to men. Note vv. 414 ff. Theano in her reply to Tisiphone does not employ the interjection. So, too, it is absent from the speeches of Deidamia in VII, 262; of Hecabe in X, 373; of Helen in X, 392; of Andromache in XIII, 274, and of Aithre in XIII, 506. Helen says ὦ Μενέλαε in XIV, 155.

"Of the 73 cases of ὦ with the vocative in the Iliad, φίλος, a word of familiarity, is used 21 times, and πέπον, a word of familiarity or impatience, is used nine times" (Scott, *l. c.*). In the Posthomerica, out of 65 cases, forms of φίλος—for the most part φίλοι—are employed 21 times. πέπον does not occur with the interjection, nor in address in Quintus.

As in the Iliad, so in the Posthomerica, the interjection and accompanying vocative stand with few exceptions at the beginning of the verse, and prevailingly as the first words of the speech. In A 158, Δ 189, Z 164, K 43, 544, Π 422, Φ 394, Ψ 19, 179 the combination falls within the verse. When ὦ φίλοι and ὦ γέρον occur they are regularly the opening words of the speech. The tendency to place the interjection at the head of the verse is not, however, in evidence in Apollonius: II 288, III 936, IV 1031, 1383, 1411. It is to be remembered that the interjection is sparingly used in the Argonautica. In the Posthomerica with five exceptions the interjection and vocative head the verse. The exceptions are II 268, V 428, VII 642, 701, XIV 155. In Apollonius the vocatives of φίλος with ὦ, excepting IV 1741, stand at the beginning of the speech. Quintus places them without exception at the head of the verse. They are placed at the beginning of the second verse in VII, 39, 690 and XII, 52. Unknown to Quintus are such combinations as φίλος ὦ Μενέλαε Δ 189, διοτρεφὲς ὦ Μενέλαε K 43 and ὦ πέπον, ὦ Μενέλαε Z 55, P 238. Apollonius has a case of the former in IV 1411: δαίμονες ὦ καλαὶ καὶ εὔφρονες.

To sum up the larger aspects of the vocative in Quintus, one finds curious coincidences between the usage in the Iliad and in the Posthomerica. The material for the coincidences is not very

abundant. The interjection is absent from prayers and addresses to the gods. It is denied women regularly and in two cases where women employ it, the ὦ connotes masculine character. The interjection is not found with patronymics. It is perhaps precarious to affirm any marked appreciation by Quintus of the Homeric circumstances of the interjection; it seems equally precarious to cite Quintus in illustration of any change of feeling for ὦ that came about in later times.

Remarkable in Nonnus is the slight use of the interjection ὦ with the vocative. The 17 cases are as follows: *ὦ πάτερ* V, 415, VII, 73, XXX, 66; *ὦ γύναι* VIII, 357, XIX, 42; *ὦ Φρύγιε Ζεῦ* X, 292; *ὦ τέκος* XVIII, 316, XXXVII, 192, XXXVIII, 196; XLIV, 191, XLVII, 165; *ὦ φίλος* XXV, 353; *ὦ φιλοι* XXXVII, 131; *ὦ γένος ἀλλοπρόσαλλον 'Ολύμπιον* XXVII, 308; *ὦ πόλι πασιμέλουσα* XL, 351; *ὦ γέρον* XLVII, 46, 52.

The next point for consideration is the distribution of the speeches in the epic poets. It is a natural and fair inference that the hero in epic as the conspicuous center of the performance should speak more frequently than any of the other characters. The inference would hardly merit the verification of an actual count if Achilles in the Iliad and Neoptolemus in the Posthomerica were not altogether absent from long stretches of the poems. In spite of this fact the supposition continues true from Homer to Nonnus. Achilles in the Iliad is found to speak 86 times, greatly exceeding the number of speeches for Hector, who comes next in order of frequency with 48. In the Odyssey, Odysseus naturally is expected to run far ahead of all other characters. The number of speeches assigned him is 164 out of a total of 636 speeches in the poem. Telemachus follows with 82. Passing from Homer to Apollonius one finds that Jason is assigned 32 speeches and Medea 17. The preponderance, however, seems to be offset by the passive unassertive character of Jason, and the feeling arises that Apollonius has unconsciously thrust him into a position of secondary importance and made Medea the larger center of interest.

Similarly in the Posthomerica, Neoptolemus though not appearing until the poem has reached its middle point, is given the greatest number of speeches—19. Nestor stands next with 14.

Finally, in Nonnus Dionysus is capable of 55 speeches, whil
Zeus trails far behind with 13.

But of greater import is the rôle of the gods as speakers in epic
The speaking done by them in the Iliad is considerable. In al
185 speeches are given them out of 675—27 per cent. The number in the Odyssey is 78, or 12 per cent. In the Argonautica 21 speeches are delivered by divinities, or 15 per cent. In Quintus comes a decline to 10 per cent., and a noteworthy decline when it is remembered that the Posthomerica is to be compared with the Iliad. It is a continuation of the Iliad rather than an anticipation of the Odyssey. The gods in Quintus, especially the more important ones of the pantheon, suffer heavily. For in the Iliad 150 speeches are spoken by Zeus, Hera, Athena, Apollo, Poseidon, Thetis, Aphrodite and Ares, while in the Posthomerica the first six of these divinities speak 12 of the 16 speeches put into the mouths of the gods. Aphrodite and Ares are without speech in Quintus. Allowance must be made in this comparison for th fact that the Iliad is twice as long as the Posthomerica and tha the former has a speech for every 21 vv., the latter, one for ever 50 vv. Zeus has 39 speeches in the Iliad, 2 in the Posthomeric Hera has 33 in the Iliad and 2 in the Posthomerica; Athena, in the Iliad, 1 in Quintus; Apollo has 18 in the Iliad, 3 in t Posthomerica; Poseidon in the Iliad has 15, in the Posthomeri 2; Thetis in the Iliad has 14, in the Posthomerica, 2. In t case of the latter, the death of Achilles early in the poem grea reduces the opportunities for speaking. This shrinkage constitu a serious limitation upon the immediate and vigorous part, whi the supernatural agency may and does play in the events of t Posthomerica. The θεομαχία in the Iliad yields a few speec by the gods; but Quintus, though he had it in mind when he wr his own theomachy in XII, 163 ff., denies all but Themis a spee (vv. 206–13).

There is an explanation for this decline. Homeric as Quint sought to be, he could not withdraw himself from the atmosphe of his own times and live completely in that of the time of Home Quintus might acquire a vocabulary that appears markedly H meric, but in the less external matter of the participation of t

Homeric gods in the affairs of Homeric men—this he could not so readily appropriate in its fullest extent. Glover[1] may say of the age of Quintus that men had climbed from the vivid anthropomorphism of Homer to conceptions of loftier and purer deity till the Zeus and Athena of the poet were names outworn, but that in spite of this there is scarcely a trace in Quintus that the world has moved since Homer sang. The story, however, of the speech in the Posthomerica shows that even in the stronghold of epic Zeus and Athena have lost power. In noticeable fashion have they and Hera receded from immediate participation in the events of the Posthomerica.

Returning to the Odyssey, one may note that Athena, Zeus, Poseidon, Apollo and Ares have together 53 speeches, Ares and Apollo appearing as speakers only once, and then in the lay of Demodocus where their appearance has nothing to do with the events of the poem. Hera, Aphrodite and Thetis do not speak in the Odyssey. Three of the speeches of Poseidon have no bearing upon the action of the epic: *θ* 347–8; 355–6, and λ 248–52, the first two falling within the lay of Demodocus.

In the Argonautica of Apollonius, Hera, Thetis, Athena and Aphrodite speak collectively 17 times. A general statement of value is made by A. Couat, *La Poesie Alexandrine*, p. 306: "On a déjà heureusement fait remarquer le rôle effacé que jouent les divinités dans les Argonautiques, et les transformations qu'elles ont subies d'Homère à Apollonius. A peine apparaissent-elles çà et là pour mettre le drame en jeu et en préparer le denouement: Héra, Cypris et Athéné qui dirigent l'action au lieu de Zeus ou d'Apollon," etc. It is noticeable that Zeus does not speak at all.[2] Apollo, Poseidon and Ares share the same fate. Ares of course is not much at home in the Argonautica. The fact that there is no need for certain gods to appear in the different epics is a sufficient explanation of their failure to speak, but speaking by Zeus in the Argonautica might reasonably be expected. Similarly in the Orphic Argonautica there is a sorry showing made by the

[1] *Life and Letters of the Fourth Century*, p. 77.

[2] v. De La Ville de Mirmont, *Apollonios de Rhodes et Virgile*, p. 177.

gods. Besides Circe, Athena speaks in 544 ff. A table may be given showing the fate of the principal gods as speakers in the epics. Differences in the length of the poems, and in the frequency of occurrence of speeches must be kept in mind:

	Vv. in Epic.	Frequency of Occurrence.	Zeus.	Hera.	Athena.	Apollo.	Poseidon.	Thetis.	Aphrodite.	Ares.
Iliad..........	15693	1 for 23 vv.	39	33	20	18	15	14	7	4
Odyssey.........	12020	1 " 19 vv.	8	0	36	1	7	0	0	1
Apollonius.....	5832	1 " 41 vv.	0	7	2	0	0	2	6	0
Quintus.........	8786	1 " 50 vv.	2	2	1	3	2	2	0	0
Nonnus.........	21279	1 " 70 vv.	13	10	5	0	4	1	9	0
Tryphiodorus..	691	1 " 86 vv.	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
Colluthus.......	392	1 " 25 vv.	1	1	1	0	0	0	3	0

It has been seen that the history of the later epic speech is one of decline in amount. This fact raises the question immediately as to the extent of oratio obliqua, for herein lurk materials for speech. Now the habitat of oratio obliqua materials for speech in Homer is within the speech itself where the presence of the direct form would not alter the percentage of speech or the number of speeches according to the method of calculation employed. The consideration of this point, however, is not likely to yield much, because epic abhors the indirect record[1] preferring the syntactically simpler and more effective form of direct discourse in obedience to the Greek craving for the exact account of what was said in this or that crisis—a craving for the vividness of μίμησις which makes the past a present and the hearer or reader a bystander.

It is just this that leads one to question the truth of the chronological sequence laid down by Hentze[2] for the history of the speech which he has embodied in the following paragraph: "Der Monolog theilt mit den übrigen im Epos verwendeten Arten der Rede die direkte Ausdrucksform. Die Wahl dieser Form, welche wir im Dialog bereits in den ältesten Epen der verschiedensten Völker angewendet finden war ursprünglich wohl nur die Folge

[1] v. Hentze[9], ψ 269.

[2] *Philologus*, LXIII (1904), 12–13.

der noch mangelhaften Ausbildung der Syntax, da die Formen der erzählten Rede noch nicht so allseitig entwickelt oder doch noch nicht so geläufig waren dass grössere Gedankenreihen sich darin ohne Schwierigkeiten wiedergeben liessen. Was aber ursprünglich nur ein Nothbehelf war wurde bei weiterer Entwicklung der epischen Kunst zu einem besonderen Kunstmittel ausgebildet, welches in hervorragender Weise dem Zweck diente, das Vergangene lebhaft zu vergegenwärtigen, und daher auch in allen andern Arten der Rede angewendet." Doubtless the complexities of oratio obliqua are late, but to find in their late coming the ultimate cause for the employment of oratio recta first in monologue and afterwards in all other forms of discourse in epic is to disregard the fact that from the start there must have been as an inevitable concomitant of *ῥῆσις* a certain conspicuous charm of directness. This must have been the overwhelming consideration that determined its use, that would have determined the choice of it, had the syntax been completely developed. The early epic poet had no reason to regret the absence of syntactical means which, had he employed them, would have denied him the very effect he desired, namely, *πρὸ ὀμμάτων ποιεῖν*.

Further evidence for the innate preference of the Greek for the direct form of expression may be adduced from his reluctance—rather his inability to get away from oratio recta in developing the obliqua. The Greek did not think the oratio obliqua as did the Roman, but had the oratio recta in mind. The experience of the Greek negative affords a clew. For oratio recta has intruded its negative *οὐ* into the company of the infinitive in oratio obliqua—an intrusion resented in conspicuous manner in Homer. The closeness of oratio obliqua to oratio recta in Greek made this transfer possible.

As examples in Homer of speech materials within speech one may cite Γ 88, Θ 415, Ι 680, where the indirect discourse is concluded by *ὣς ἔφατ'*—a practice recurring in Apollonius, IV 236, 592, 1121, but not as in Homer within a speech. So in Odyssey, *α* 42, *ὣς ἔφαθ' Ἑρμείας* concludes an indirect record within a speech. See also *θ* 570, *ρ* 143–6, where, after *φῆ*, the oratio obliqua passes into oratio recta in *ἥ μιν ἀνάγκῃ ἴσχει*, and

ψ 267–84. Hayman[1] remarks that it is very doubtful whether Homer contains an instance of oratio obliqua carried consistently through three subordinate clauses, thanks to a native buoyancy of style which speedily rectifies an oratio commenced as obliqua.

In Apollonius *μίμησις* is encroached upon by *ἁπλῆ διήγησις*, though the materials for speech are not abundant. The best opportunity is to be found in III, 579–608 in the indirectly recorded threat of Aeetes. In IV, 230–5 words of threat are concluded by *ὣς ἔφατ' Αἰήτης*. The words of prophecy and command uttered by the oaken beam in IV, 585–91 are not set forth in the direct form, although it was *αὔδηεν*, and the passage is concluded by *ὣς 'Αργὼ ἰάχησεν*. A message, IV, 1115–20, clumsily given in oratio obliqua is also concluded by *ὣς ἄρ' ἔφη*. These passages differ from cases of oratio obliqua, recorded above for Homer, in that they are not within speeches.

An examination of the Posthomerica shows that the materials for speech are very slight. The best instance of oratio obliqua, IX, 410–22, occurs in a passage descriptive of the embassy of Odysseus and Diomedes to Philoctetes—a passage where direct speech might have been employed effectively. As it is, the whole embassy is unmarked by any speech. Quintus seems to have been disinclined to elaborate a second embassy scene. In the embassy of the same chieftains to Neoptolemus in VII, 169–368 speech is employed. XI, 269–71 presents opportunity and material for prayer, of which there is a scanty amount in the Posthomerica. Note also XII, 392–4 where oratio recta might have been employed with good effect. These instances also differ from the Homeric in not occurring within a speech. But the material in both Apollonius and Quintus is meagre, and had it been made over into oratio recta would not affect much the percentage of speech for these authors.

Another source of decline in the amount of speech and the number of speeches lies in the marked reluctance of the later epic to repeat. An examination of Homer shows that repetition of a speech completely as oratio recta is limited to a few instances, one

[1] *Odyssea*, vol. I, Appendix XXII.

in the Iliad, B 23–33 = B 60–70, where Agamemnon repeats to the elders the exact words that Ὄνειρος had spoken to him; and the following in the Odyssey: β 96–102 = τ 141–7 = ω 131–7; δ 333–50 = ρ 124–141; π 288–94 = τ 7–13. Parallels to this phenomenon are not forthcoming in the later epic. Of repetition begun in oratio obliqua, but shifting to oratio recta and thereby involving the exact recurrence of some verses, and of repetition incurred in other ways—of this there is a considerable amount in the Iliad and Odyssey. Leaf[1] says that the frequent repetition of messages shows what the epic poet liked, though objecting to the third repetition in B 60 ff. as too much. An excellent case of repetition is I 122–57 = I 264–299. If the single recurrence of blocks of verses is abhorred by the later epic poets, still more impossible would be the double repetition found in B 11–15 = 28–32 = 65–9; β 96–102 = τ 141–7 = ω 131–7.

An interesting comment on the difference in feeling toward repetition between Homer and Quintus may be drawn from the statistics of Schmidt[2] and the observation of Paschal.[3] Schmidt finds that there are 1804 verses in Homer, which together recur 4730 times, and that if slight differences be overlooked there are 2118 verses which appear together 5612 times. In striking contrast to this abundance is the poverty of Quintus, from whose Posthomerica Paschal has gathered together a scanty collection of five verses which recur every one once. A few more may be added to his list: II, 390 = III, 435; III, 465–6 = V, 538–9; IV, 94 = IV, 104; V, 603 = VI, 21; VI, 59 = XIV, 235. The verse ὣς φάμενον προσέειπεν Ἀχιλλέος ὄβριμος υἱός is found in VII, 219, 700; VIII, 146; XII, 66; XIII, 237. This conspicuous avoidance of repeated verses may fairly be construed as an indication that in congeneric ῥήσεις, coincidences are the unconscious but natural result of recurring situations; *e. g.*, III, 465–6 = V, 538–9. Apollonius would not show up so well in the matter of repetition.

Taking up the Posthomerica in detail one may note an oppor-

[1] Iliad, A 366.

[2] *Parallel Homer*, VIII; v. *A. J. P.*, VI (1885), p. 399.

[3] *A Study of Quintus of Smyrna*, p. 36.

tunity for a speech by Athena in the guise of Ὄνειρος and its repetition by Epeius to the Greeks in xii, 109–20, but both opportunities are passed over. How Homer might have handled the passage may perhaps be inferred from B 23–33 = 60–70. There is not a case in Quintus where a command is given to a messenger as such in oratio recta and delivered in oratio recta. What might be regarded as instances of approximation to this are the commands which occur in the speeches of Odysseus in xii, 25–45, and of the shade of Achilles in xiv, 185–222. The command in the former is not definitely directed, though later fulfilled by Sinon. Odysseus inserts in his speech the very words in part which later are to be told to the Trojans when they ask why the wooden horse was built, vv. 37–8: "τὸν (ἵππον) ἐκάμοντο / Παλλάδι χωομένῃ Τρώων ὕπερ αἰχμητάων." But Quintus, reluctant to repeat,[1] has Sinon say, xii, 377–8, δαΐφρονι Τριτογενείῃ ἵππον ἐτεκτήναντο. The second speech to be considered is not one solely of command for the Achaeans, but in the first part is one of advice to Neoptolemus.

In iii, 699 and xiv, 467 Hermes and Iris are sent as messengers to Aeolus. There is no speech. In xiv, 478–9 we learn that Iris told Aeolus the command of Athena. The class of messenger speeches is wanting in Quintus, and Iris the messenger of Zeus, who speaks twelve times in the Iliad does not speak in the Posthomerica. One misses there the words of Zeus βάσκ' ἴθι Ἶρι ταχεῖα that recur in the Iliad.[2] Quintus has herein denied himself opportunities for introducing commands repeated in substance such as Iris delivers, which involve recurrent verses; *e. g.*, Λ 189–94, 204–9. It is of interest to note in connection with iii, 699 where Hermes is the messenger of Zeus that in the older epic poetry he was not yet a messenger of the gods. He appears as messenger of Zeus in α 38, ε 29, while Iris as messenger of the gods has completely disappeared from the Odyssey.[3] Iris speaks once in the Argonautica of Apollonius,

[1] Cf. Nonnus, xviii, 318–9, with xxi, 231–237.

[2] Θ 399, Λ 186, Ο 158, Ω 144.

[3] v. C. Hentze, *Das Auftreten der Iris in der Ilias. Philol.*, lxii (1903), 323, note 5.

II, 288, but not in her capacity as messenger. In correlated speeches Quintus is found to repeat only a single verse, IV 94 = 104. Neoptolemus gives the substance of his father's command to the Argives; he does not repeat the words of it.

Exact repetition in correlated speeches in Apollonius is confined to one verse, owing partly to the failure of the poet to introduce speech within speech. Very few are the instances in which Apollonius repeats even the substance of a command for he is generally satisfied with the bare announcement that a command was delivered and that one of the company reported to his fellows words intended for all. To take up some of the passages in illustration. The command of Hypsipyle to Iphinoe in I, 703–707 is repeated in substance by Iphinoe to the Minyae, vv, 712–6. The restrictions of oratio obliqua have prevented exact repetition. But in I, 847 the reader is told that Hypsipyle's long speech, I, 793–833, to Jason was repeated to his company, but there is no speech by Jason—only *πάντα διηνεκέως ἀγόρευσεν*. The words of Mopsus to Jason, I, 1092–1102, are reported by Jason to the company in v. 1106 without speech. In III, 495–500 Jason reports in part the words of Aeetes, vv. 401–21, practically repeating v. 410 in 496. In III, 1165 Jason informs his companions of his conversation with Medea, but he does not speak in the direct form—*πιφαυσκόμενος τὰ ἕκαστα*. Hera gives certain commands to Iris in IV, 757–69. They are delivered to Thetis, Hephaestus and Aeolus. This one learns from the simple announcement that the bidding of Hera was fulfilled, vv. 773–9. So again in IV, 783–832 Hera in the course of her speech gives Thetis certain commands. In v. 845 the reader is informed that these commands were conveyed by Thetis to the Nereids. Instead of *ῥῆσις* embodying either the words or the substance of Hera's bidding one reads: *Θέτις δ'ἀγόρευεν ἐφετμὰς* / *Ἥρης*. In IV, 881 in place of any reiteration of the command of Thetis in a speech, we read that Peleus spoke to his companions the whole of it. Arete in IV, 1115–20 gives a message for Jason which the poet puts in the indirect form. The messenger finds Jason, but his words are not recorded. The reader learns in v. 1125 that the messenger delivered the whole

message: *ἐκ δ' ἄρα πᾶσαν / πέφραδε ἀγγελίην.* One of the best instances of repetition in substance in the Argonautica occurs in IV, 1347–62 where Jason reporting the words of the Ἡρῷσσαι, vv. 1318–29, repeats one verse, 1323 = 1358. The change of pronoun in v. 1354 disturbs its perfect equation with v. 1328.

From a survey of these passages the conclusion seems a fair one that Apollonius and Quintus are inclined to avoid what the reader already knows. This is what Heinze[1] has said of Vergil in comparison with Homer. The repetition of blocks of verses is a feature of the Homeric epic sufficiently prominent to have been noticed and employed by any close imitator. Apollonius and Quintus must have been conscious of this important aspect of the Homeric manner and in failing to continue it show a certain independence that connotes a criticism of the leisure of the elder epic—a conclusion confirmed by the curtailment of reminiscence in their poems. In the matter of repetition and in that of the speech within speech one cannot apply the words of Couat[2]: "Ce qui est certain, c'est que partout, dans Apollonius, se laisse voir le travail d'un imitateur zélé d'Homère." Nor for Quintus in these respects can one accept the words of Sainte-Beuve[3]: "Il résulte de cette imitation *scrupuleuse et comme filiale* à laquelle il s'est voué, qu'il est simple," etc. That the reluctance of Quintus to repeat is to be attributed to the precedent of Vergil cannot safely be affirmed. Perhaps Apollonius exercised some influence. That Apollonius in eliminating repetition was reflecting the critical literary feeling of his own time seems in a way to meet with confirmation in the action of Zenodotus who arbitrarily compressed B 60–70 into two verses. The absence of repetition in the later epic may be regarded as a slight factor in the decline in amount of speech which marks the poems of Apollonius and Quintus.

In still further pursuing the differences between the speeches of Homer and his successors, one may consider the matter of the monologue. The temptation to compare Homer and Quintus

[1] *Virgils Epische Technik*, p. 398 ff.

[2] *Op. cit.*, p. 512.

[3] *Etude sur Virgile suivie d'une étude sur Quintus de Smyrne*, p. 318.

immediately leads one to violate the chronological order in the discussion. C. Hentze[1] records all the instances of monologue in Homer. There are 21, 11 in the Iliad and 10 in the Odyssey. Quintus has five monologues as follows: I, 100–14 (Andromache); III, 57–9 (Apollo); V, 465–81 (Aias); X, 424–31 (Oenone); X, 471–6 (nymph). The lament in general, especially that of Thetis, III, 608–30, in which no address is made to the dead Achilles, may be regarded as a close approximation to the monologue. The Homeric formula frequently used to introduce the monologue, *ὀχθήσας δ' ἄρα εἶπε πρὸς ὃν μεγαλήτορα θυμόν* is missed in Quintus. The forms are I, 99, *μάλα τοῖα φίλῳ προσελέξατο θυμῷ*: III, 56, *Φοῖβος ἑὸν κατὰ θυμὸν ἔπος ποτὶ τοῖον ἔειπεν*: V, 464, *λυγρὸν ἀνεστονάχησεν*: X, 423, *αἰνὰ δ' ἀναστενάχουσα φίλον προσελέξατο θυμόν*: X, 471, *καί τις ἑὸν κατὰ θυμὸν ἔπος ποτὶ τοῖον ἔειπεν.* The conception of the monologue in Homer[2] as a kind of dialogue in which the speaker half personifies his own thoughts as something distinct from him is not so clearly in evidence in Quintus, as is seen in the forms of introduction.

The Homeric monologues are distributed largely among the chief characters.[3] This is not the case in Quintus. Neoptolemus, the hero of the epic, is not given a monologue. Zeus in the Iliad has two, but none in the Posthomerica. Apollo alone of the gods has a monologue of three verses. The monologues in Quintus have Homeric beginnings: I, 100, *ἂ δειλή*: III, 57, *ὢ πόποι*: V, 465, *ὤ μοι ἐγώ*: X, 424, *ὤ μοι.* The monologues in Homer concern themselves regularly with the speaker. In Quintus half of them do, for the close of Andromache's monologue, I, 100–14, is personal. There is not a clear case in Quintus of the "Entscheidungsmonolog." The nearest approach to such are the monologues of Aias, V, 465–81 and Oenone, X, 424–31. As narrative substitutes for the Entscheidungsmonolog may be cited: I, 601–10, *ὥρμηνεν ἢ . . . . ἢ* concluded by *καὶ τὰ μὲν ὣς ὥρμαινε*, 610; I, 706–13; V, 355–9 concluded also by *καὶ τὰ*

[1] *Die Monologe in den Homerischen Epen. Philol.*, LXIII (1904), 14.
[2] v. Leaf[2], Z 523.
[3] Hentze, *l. c.*, 14.

μὲν ὣς ὥρμαινε, 359; IX, 238–9, *ὁρμαίνεσκεν*. Cf. Iliad, A 189 ff., and Hentze, *l. c.*, 22. The Homeric scheme for the Entscheidungsmonolog, outlined by Hentze, introductory exclamation, presentation and consideration of possibilities of action, transition formula, decision—a logical order—will not do for the monologues just cited from Quintus. The latter seem open to the criticism which Heinze[1] has passed upon the Vergilian speech that the sequence of thought is psychological rather than logical. It is to be noted that Quintus does not offer a single example of the type of Entscheidungsmonolog which predominates in the Iliad,[2] namely, that in which it is a question whether the speaker is to face the foe or withdraw from the fight. This is a noteworthy point of divergence from the Iliad. The Entscheidungsmonolog would greatly relieve the monotony of the epic conflict in Quintus, especially in the eleventh book where, in 501 verses, there is a collection of three speeches aggregating only 14 verses. Homeric examples of this type of monologue are Λ 404–10 (Odysseus); P 91–105 (Menelaus); Φ 553–70 (Agenor); X 99–130 (Hector). Inasmuch as Vergil, according to Heinze,[3] has only one monologue of this class and that of the dramatic type rather than the epic, one is tempted to see in the absence of the Entscheidungsmonolog from Quintus a touch of Vergilian influence.[4]

The two functions which combined or singly the monologue may serve, namely, those of characterization and contribution to the movement of the poem are illustrated for Quintus by the monologue of Andromache, I, 100–14, and that of Aias, V, 465–81. The former both contributes to the progress of the action by preparing for the death of Penthesilea and characterizes Andromache. Both Andromache and Aias are brought nearer the reader. The feelings dominating their thought are exhibited. By a simple and natural association of ideas, the boastful promise of Penthesilea to slay Achilles brings to expression the great

[1] *Op. cit.*, 418. [2] v. Hentze, *l. c.*, 15. [3] *Op. cit.*, 419.

[4] J. W. Basore remarks the utter absence of this type of monologue from Lucan; v. *T. P. A. P. A.*, XXXV (1904), xciv–vi.

sorrow that is ever uppermost in the mind of Andromache. For no sooner has she rebuked the Amazon for her folly in aspiring to do what the mightier Hector tried to do at the cost of his life than she turns to a recollection of the high regard paid to Hector by the people, to give way again to thoughts of her own loss and the sorrow that is in store for her all her days. The beginning of the monologue prepares for a crisis—the death of the Amazon queen, but the close is an expression of personal feeling. The same principle of association of ideas seems to be at work here as in the monologue of Achilles, Σ 6 ff.[1] Again, the monologue of Apollo, III 57–9, prepares for a similar crisis—the death of Achilles. The words of Thetis in Iliad, Ω 131–2, that death stands near her son, the similar statements in III 16–7, 44 of the Posthomerica culminate in the recognition by Apollo that no one can now save Achilles, not even Zeus. The inevitableness of the event is reflected in the brevity of the monologue and the death of Achilles is, therefore, immediately expected. The function of the monologue here is to precipitate action. Hentze has remarked an adaptation of the monologue in Homer to each situation and to the feelings of the speaker, citing Υ 424 ff. and ν 199 ff. The former is spoken by Achilles when he sees Hector in battle for the first time and contains only three verses with two thoughts thrust out in passionate haste. But in ν 199 ff., a monologue of seventeen verses, there is a long string of fears, wishes, apprehensions which oppress the soul of Odysseus when he thinks the Phaeacians have not brought him home. Of a different character are the words a nymph utters to herself in X, 471–6 of the Posthomerica. Her monologue marks the close of the unhappy episode of Paris and Oenone. It is the judgment of a chorus passed upon Paris.

In the Argonautica of Apollonius, Heinze[2] has noted that the monologue is confined to Medea: III 464–70; 636–44; 771–801; IV 30–3. To these should be added the monologue of Μήνη in IV 57–65. The conception of the monologue as a kind of dialogue between the speaker and his thoughts is not so clear

[1] v. Hentze, *l. c.*, 20.

[2] *Op. cit.*, 422.

as in Homer. The introductory forms offer no coincidences with the Homeric: III 635, *ἀδινῇν δ' ἀνενείκατο φωνήν*: III 770, *δοάσσατο φώνησέν τε*: IV 56, *καὶ τοῖα μετὰ φρεσὶν ᾗσιν ἔειπεν*. In this scanty collection of monologues Jason has no share at all—a departure from Homeric habit which distributes the monologues among the chief characters. The initial forms of the monologue in Homer are not employed by Apollonius. Instead there occurs *δειλὴ ἐγώ(ν)*, III, 636, 771. The monologues of Medea serve the twofold function of characterizing the speaker and preparing the way for the fulfilment by Jason of the requirements laid upon him by Aeetes. The agitation of the mind of Medea, the struggle between heart and head depicted and developed in these monologues culminates in her resolve to help Jason. It is the immediate starting point for the solution of the situation in accord with the will of Hera.

From the monologue one may pass to a consideration of dialogue. Noticeable indeed in the Posthomerica is the curtailment of the dialogue, especially that involving gods—a fact that constitutes an important departure from Homer. Stretches of dialogue, such as occur in the Iliad, Ξ 187–221, and at the opening of the third book of the Argonautica are not to be paralleled in Quintus. One misses the words *τὸν (τὴν) δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος* which mark so frequently the conclusion of one speech and the beginning of another in Homeric dialogue. Quintus has altogether discarded this form and the others involving the participle *ἀπαμειβόμενος*. In III, 40–2 Apollo speaks to Achilles and receives a reply in vv. 46–52. In XIV, 427–42 Athena speaks to Zeus, and Zeus answers in vv. 444–8. This is the nearest approach to conversation in which gods participate. Brief and devoid of discourse is the assembly of the gods in II, 164–82. The dialogues in Homer in which gods take part are conveniently gathered together by Cauer.[1] A dialogue of four speeches, if one may so consider the *ὅπλων κρίσις*, is the limit for Quintus. The speeches in the *ὅπλων κρίσις* are in effect dialogue, for though judges have been appointed, the speakers ignore them and address

[1] Beigaben zu Ilias und Odyssee (1905), 61; s. v. *Göttergespräche*.

their words to each other. The three speeches collectively by Nestor and Podalirius in the seventh book may be cited as an instance of the extent for Quintus. The observation of Heinze[1] that Vergil does not allow the action to halt as Homer does, and the characters to engage in protracted discourse is applicable also to Quintus particularly in the eleventh book, but less so in the eighth. In the battle that rages by the ships in the Iliad, Idomeneus and Meriones meet and hold a dialogue, N 249–94, which has nothing to do with the conclusion of the battle. For such dialogue Quintus has no parallel, with the result that the eleventh book of the Posthomerica with its three paltry speeches, amounting to 14 verses, is denied another[2] fruitful means of mitigating the tedium of epic strife. Curiously enough, the twenty-eighth book of Nonnus with the same amount of speech suffers from a similarly unrelieved plethora of fight. In the Posthomerica of the speeches addressed by Greeks to Trojans, or Trojan allies and *vice versa*, the longest are those of Memnon and Achilles, II, 412–51, but they do not attain to the length of the speeches of Achilles and Aeneas in Υ 177–258. So, too, in the speeches of victors and vanquished Homer extends as in the case of Achilles and Lycaon, Φ 74–113, to a greater degree than Quintus. Cf. XIII, 191–202; 226–40.

In the shrinkage of this element so important in epic, Quintus is perhaps under the influence of Vergil, who also in comparison with Homer shows a marked lack of dialogue.[3] Heinze observes that the dialogue in epic contributes only in rare instances to help on the main theme, but serves rather to bring the characters nearer the reader because their mutual relations are set forth or developed before his eyes. The ὅπλων κρίσις presents a good delineation of the characters of Aias and Odysseus—the passion of the one, the self-control of the other. But the general absence of dialogue beyond speech and reply imposes a serious limitation upon the possibilities of χαρακτηρισμός in the Posthomerica. Vergil seems to have passed on to subsequent Roman epic the

[1] *Op. cit.*, 402.
[2] v. p. 38.
[3] Heinze, 397.

suppression of the dialogue, for Basore, *l. c.*, finds in Lucan a marked tendency to restrict the elaboration of speech scenes: "In only one instance does he group more than two speakers and only twice exceeds the limits of simple address and reply." Apollonius is better off for dialogue. Besides the excellent illustration to be cited from the opening of the third book which adds so much to the life of the narrative are the conversations between Chalciope and Medea, III, 674–738, and Jason and Medea, III, 975–1145.

The speeches oomprising dialogue in Greek epic are never immediately consecutive. To this the narrative character of epic is opposed. Between the speeches is put at least a single verse. Vergil has a bit of dialogue in which the speeches are not separated, VI, 713–22.

Of that class of speeches which has been called "Chorreden" Hentze[1] has gathered 28 examples from Homer, 10 from the Iliad, 18 from the Odyssey. They may be called collective speeches. In the Iliad the speakers are generally the Greek and Trojan warriors. The introductory formula is in the majority of cases *ὧδε δέ τις εἴπεσκεν* frequently followed by *ἰδὼν ἐς πλησίον ἄλλον.* The iterative form of the verb accompanied by *ἄλλος* or *τις* for subject shows that the speech is conceived of as spoken by more than one. The collective speeches in Apollonius are: I, 242–6; 251–9; IV, 1251–8, 1318–29. In II, 145–53; IV, 1458–60 the subject is the indefinite *τις*, but without the iterative verbal form which Apollonius does not employ in the collective speeches. In IV, 1318–29 only, the subject is plural in form—*ἡρῷσσαι.* The forms of introduction used are not in any case Homeric, though those of conclusion in some instances differ only slightly. These speeches express feeling and opinion rather than occasion action.

Quintus has four collective speeches. In two XIV, 117–9; 254–6 the subject is plural. For I, 212–9 a plurality of speakers is effected by *ἄμ' ἀγρομένοισιν* in the introductory verse. In I, 751–4 the iterative *εἴπεσκεν* gives the distributive effect. The

[1] *Philol.*, LXIV (1905), 254–68.

speaker in I, 357; IV, 19, 33; XII, 254, 552; XIII, 14, 468; XIV, 602 is the indefinite τις or ἄλλος, but the verbal forms are not iterative. In place of the Homeric εἴπεσκε, there occurs in Quintus ἔειπεν (4), ἔκφατο μῦθον (2), φάτο μῦθον (1). The familiar Homeric ὧδε δέ τις εἴπεσκεν and ἰδὼν ἐς πλησίον ἄλλον do not occur in Quintus. Neither are the forms of conclusion Homeric. Though provoked by the preceding context, this group of speeches is otiose so far as contributing to the progress of the action is concerned, except in I, 212–19, which concluding with an exhortation to fight precipitates a battle. None of the collective speeches in Quintus is given up to prayer. In XIV, 117–9 one verse is prayer. For Homeric examples v. Γ 297 ff., 318 ff.; Η 177 ff., 200 ff.

With reference to structure Heinze has pointed out as characteristic of the old epic speech its unlimited powers of extension, especially in the admission of new epic material. When and where the poet pleases he lets the speech become narrative. The principle of concentration and of compression in Quintus is seen in the fact that he has no speech of greater length than 50 verses, while Apollonius only once rises to 97 verses. Nonnus, however, exhibits a return to the extension of the older epic; *e. g.*, XI, 356–481; XXXVIII, 105–434.

In Apollonius and Quintus there is a noticeable curtailment of reminiscence. The old men in the Posthomerica talk less than they do in Homer, though the latter is dramatically true when he allows Nestor and Phoenix to talk on. The speech of Phoenix to Achilles in I 434–605 contains 131 verses of digression in the form of detailed reminiscence. The best example in the Argonautica is the bit of reminiscence in II, 775–91. That it was quite consciously compressed may be gathered from the author's own words, I, 1220: ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν τηλοῦ κεν ἀποπλάγξειεν ἀοιδῆς. Quintus cannot show more than 13 verses in one speech; III, 467–79, where Phoenix laments over the body of Achilles; IV, 307–19, in the speech of Nestor to the Greeks.

A comparative survey of the congeneric speeches in Quintus does not show that any fixed forms were in the mind of the poet, although Quintus frequently uses the same material over again.

So a comparison of the twelve laments in the Posthomerica—and there is an abundance of lament—shows the recurrence of commonplace strains sometimes in the same or nearly the same words. But totally foreign to Quintus and Greek epic poetry is the aggravated anaphora of which Nonnus is capable in one of the laments, XVI, 354–6. Frequently in Quintus, at the beginning of a lament, is the strain:

II, 609, *ὤλεό μοι, φίλε τέκνον, ἐῇ δ' ἄρα μητέρι πένθος*
ἀργαλέον περίθηκας.
III, 463, *ὤλεό μοι, φίλε τέκνον, ἐμοὶ δ' ἄχος αἰὲν ἄφυκτον*
κάλλιπες.
X, 373, *ὤλεό μοι, φίλε τέκνον, ἐμοὶ δ' ἐπὶ πένθεσι πένθος*
κάλλιπες αἰὲν ἄφυκτον,
X, 392, *ἆνερ ἐμοὶ καὶ Τρωσὶ καὶ αὐτῷ σοι μέγα πῆμα*
ὤλεο λευγαλέως· ἐμὲ δ' ἐν στυγερῇ κακότητι
κάλλιπες

Scattered through the laments one finds the stereotyped wish that the one lamenting had died before the time of such grief had come:

III, 464, *ὡς ὄφελόν με χυτὴ κατὰ γαῖα κεκεύθει*
πρὶν σέο πότμον ἰδέσθαι ἀμείλιχον. οὐ γὰρ ἔμοιγε
ἄλλο χερειότερόν ποτ' ἐσήλυθεν ἐς φρένα πῆμα,
III, 573, *ὡς ὄφελόν με*
γαῖα χυτὴ ἐκάλυψε, πάρος σέο πότμον ἰδέσθαι.
V, 537, *ὥς μ' ὄφελον τὸ πάροιθε περὶ τραφερὴ χάνε γαῖα*
πρὶν σέο πότμον ἰδέσθαι ἀμείλιχον. οὐ γὰρ ἔμοιγε
ἄλλο χερειότερον ποτ' ἐσήλυθεν ἐς φρένα πῆμα,
X, 379, *τὰ μὴ ὤφειλον ὀτλῆσαι*
ἀλλ' ἔθανον τὸ πάροιθεν ἐν εἰρήνῃ τε καὶ ὄλβῳ.
XIV, 301, *ὥς μ' ὄφελον μετὰ σεῖο, φίλον τέκος, ἤματι τῷδε*
γαῖα χανοῦσα κάλυψε, πάρος σέο πότμον ἰδέσθαι.

Akin to such passages are these expressions of wish:

X, 395, *ὡς ὄφελόν μ' Ἅρπυιαι ἀνηρείψαντο πάροιθεν,*

x, 405, ὡς ὄφελόν μ' ἕλεν Αἶσα, πάρος τάδε πήματ' ἰδέσθαι.
x, 428, ὥς μ' ὄφελόν ποτε Κῆρες ἀνηρείψαντο μέλαιναι,

In the group of speeches addressed to fallen foes the coincidences are mostly in the *προοίμια*:

I, 644, *κεῖσό νυν ἐν κονίῃσι κυνῶν βόσις ἠδ' οἰωνῶν δειλαίη.*
I, 757, *κεῖσό νυν ἐν κονίῃσι λελασμένος ἀφροσυνάων.*
V, 441 = I, 644.
VI, 385, *κεῖσό νυν ἐν κονίῃσι*
VI, 431, *νῦν μὲν δὴ σύγε κεῖσο κατὰ χθονός.*

The idea of coming against one's better also occurs in I, 758 and VI, 388. In the exhortations to fight Quintus shows a tendency to a recurring initial form:

I, 409, *ὦ φίλαι, ἄλκιμον ἦτορ ἐνὶ στέρνοισι βαλοῦσαι*
VI, 604, *ὦ φίλοι, εἰ δ' ἄγε θυμὸν ἐνὶ στέρνοισι βαλόντες*
VIII, 15, *κέκλυτέ μευ, θεράποντες, ἀρήιον ἐν φρεσὶ θυμόν θέντες,*
IX, 85, *ὦ φίλοι, εἰ δ' ἄγε θυμὸν ἀρήιον ἐν φρεσὶ θέσθε*

The character of the Argonautica is not favorable to these congeneric speeches.

Among the other speeches in Quintus that invite examination is the tetralogy unique in epic poetry that is known as the *ὅπλων κρίσις*, V, 181–316. Thetis, at the conclusion of the games in honor of Achilles, calls upon the chieftain of the Achaeans that saved the body of her son to come and receive his armor (vv. 123–7). Odysseus and Telamonian Aias rise in response and a forensic discussion is made possible. They both agree on Idomeneus, Nestor and Agamemnon as judges, but on the advice of Nestor these decline, and Trojan captives are assigned to decide on the claims and merits of the two contestants. Quintus has given both Aias and Odysseus two opportunities to speak. Aias speaks first, and when he has stated his case in 56 verses, is followed by Odysseus in a speech of 52 verses. Then Aias

replies in 14 and Odysseus in 10. It is to be recalled that the first two speeches are the longest in the Posthomerica, and when we remember that Euripides influenced Quintus[1] there is a temptation to see in the length of these speeches an approximation to the normal length of the Euripidean *λόγος δικανικός*. For Lees[2] observes that the average length of the court speeches in that poet is a little less than 50 verses. The balance, observable in the length of the speeches of the *ὅπλων κρίσις*, is also paralleled by a similar phenomenon in the Euripidean *λόγοι δικανικοί*. As in the *λόγοι ἐναγώνιοι* of Thucydides so in the *ὅπλων κρίσις* the first speaker loses his case. The analysis of these speeches may now be given.

SPEECH OF AIAS, VV. 181–236.

προοίμιον	181– 2.	What deity has deceived you to contend against me?
πίστις: *α*	183–90.	You did not keep back the Trojans from the body of Achilles, but I did while you cowered in fear. No brave heart is in your breast.
β	191– 4.	You sought to avoid coming with the Achaeans and were brought along against your will.
γ	195– 7.	You were responsible for leaving Philoctetes in Lemnos.
δ	198– 9.	You caused the death of Palamedes.
ε	200–10.	I saved you as you cowered in the fray when deserted by others.
ζ	211–14.	You placed your ships in the center, nor did you dare as I to beach them on the outside.
η	215– 6.	You did not keep off fire from the ships as I.
θ	216– 7.	I opposed Hector and you feared him.
ι	218–23.	Trusting to skill in speech you desire great deeds, but had this contest been on the field of battle about Achilles, you would have seen

[1] Kehmptzow, *De Quinti Smyrnaei Fontibus ac Mythopoeia*, p. 27: "Quintum . . . . imbutum quasi indole Euripidea," Paschal, *op. cit.*, p. 75.
[2] Δικανικὸς Λόγος in Euripides, p. 9.

me carrying to the huts the armor and the body of the warrior.

κ 224– 8. You have not the strength to put on the armor of Achilles or to wield his mighty spear, but it is fitting for me, who am no disgrace to the glorious gifts of the god, to wear it.

ἐπίλογος 229–36. Thetis made this a warrior's contest of courage, not of words. I know I am braver than you. Achilles and I are of the same blood.

Speech of Odysseus, 239–90.

προοίμιον 239. Aias of unmeasured speech, why do you rashly speak so much?

πίστις : *α* 240–67. You say that I am worthless and craven who boast myself superior to you in counsel and in speech. All things are accomplished by mind. A man of skilful device is better than one without sense, for every enterprise. I brought Achilles to the help of the Atreidae, and by persuasive word shall bring whomsoever is needed. Valor without discretion is of no avail. Both the gods have given me.

β 268–75. You did not save me from the foe as you say. I did not flee, but opposed the onslaught of the Trojans and slew many. You did not help me in the fray, but took care that no spear might overcome you as you fled.

γ 275– 8. I did not beach my ships in the center in fear of the foe, but that I might bring help with the Atreidae.

δ 278–81. With self-inflicted wounds I entered into the city of Troy to learn their plans for war.

ε 282– 4. I did not fear Hector, but was among the first to leap upon him when he challenged all.

ζ 285– 6. I killed far more of the foe about Achilles than you and saved his body and his armor.

ἐπίλογος 287–90. I do not fear your spear, but a grievous wound afflicts me which I sustained in fight about the slain Achilles. The blood of Zeus flows in Achilles's veins and mine.

Second Speech of Aias, 292–305.

πίστις 292–305. I marked you not, crafty Odysseus, in the moil when the Trojans sought to drag away Achilles, nor did any other of the Argives. But I overcame many by my lance and caused the Trojans to flee to their city. If you had the courage at the time, you did not fight near me, but somewhere off—not about the godlike Achilles where there was strife indeed.

Second Speech of Odysseus, 307–16.

πίστις 307–16. Aias I deem no one more paltry in mind and might than you. In mind I am your superior by far and in might your equal, if not more. This the Trojans and you know clearly for you struggled in the wrestling match at the time of the games in honor of Patroclus.

The speeches of the ὅπλων κρίσις are obviously the product of some rhetorical influence. Their susceptibility to the main divisions of an oration is modified a little, as in Thucydides, by the fact that they are imbedded in a narrative, for this often renders unnecessary the insertion of a πρόθεσις in the first of the speeches. In the present instance there is no πρόθεσις, but it may be constructed by the reader out of verse 125: ἀλλ' ἴτω ὅς τ' ἐσάωσε νέκυν καὶ ἄριστος 'Αχαιῶν. The προοίμια and ἐπίλογοι are slight affairs. The passion of Aias hurries him to the πίστις and causes a violation of the rhetorical rule of Greek oratory that a speech must not begin abruptly with a question.[1] In both of the first two

[1] Among extant Greek orations only one exception is found to this restriction and that is Lysias, IX, where Jebb sees traces of mutilation; v. *Attic Orators*, I, 233.